DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 460 52 LI 001 872

AUTHOR	Hartsfield, Annie Mary; And Others
TITLE	Study of State Library Legislation.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Univ., Tallahassee. Library School.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0746
PUB DATE	Jun 70
GRANT	OEG-4-9-190746-0014-095
NOTE	95p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.85
DESCRIPTORS	*Evaluation, *Federal Legislation, *Public Libraries, *State Legislation, *State Libraries

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study are to: (1) analyze current state library legislation in relation to a number of characteristics of the states to determine patterns of state-level legislation; (2) correlate information about legislation which provides present grants-in-aid support for library development and operation; (3) describe and analyze the relationship of state support in the light of information gained in (1) and (2); and (4) suggest guidelines for further legislative programs. Three categories of investigation were undertaken: (1) a compilation and analysis of current state public library legislative policy and support level, (2) an investigation of the environmental relationships associated with variations in state public library policy and state support and (3) a review of the current status of state public library legislative policy with recommendations for modification and the adoption of future policy. This study produced no evidence that state library legislation is patterned along common background characteristics of the states. The legislation is most alike in terms of permissiveness, service responsibilities and fiscal limitations rather than income, population, etc. (NH)

ED042460

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 8-0746
Grant No. OEG-4-9-190746-0014-095

STUDY OF STATE LIBRARY LEGISLATION

Annie Mary Hartsfield
Douglas St. Angelo
Harold Goldstein
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

June, 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

LI 001872

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The investigators are most grateful for the interest and energy devoted by the Advisory Committee to the Study:

Mrs. Carma R. Leigh, Director, California State Library
Mr. Edmon Low, Professor, University of Michigan
Mr. Charles Reid, Trustee, Free Public Library, Paramus, New Jersey
Mrs. Sara K. Srygley, Professor, School of Library Science, Florida State University
Miss Nettie B. Taylor, Director, Library Extension Division, Department of Education, Maryland

In addition, Dr. Alex Ladenson, Acting Director, Chicago Public Library, served as the authority on library legislation. Mr. Robert H. Rohlf, Director, Hennepin County Library, Minneapolis, advised the researchers on the content of the preliminary draft and the final report.

Three graduate students served invaluably as research assistants to the study: Tanya Connor, L. Douglas Dobson, and George Hughes.

Dr. James W. Dyson, Associate Professor of Government, Florida State University, gave unstintingly of his advice in the preparation of data necessary for the study. Without his help, many of the statistical results would have been impossible. Dr. Thomas R. Dye, Chairman, Department of Government, Florida State University, kindly allowed the investigators the use of private data resources.

Additionally, the capable and constant help of these secretaries is acknowledged:

Mrs. Harriett Campbell
Mrs. Ann Fountain
Miss Auvella Gaskins
Mrs. Linda Herrera
Mrs. Mariana Knox

The researchers are indebted to these people and others who participated in the research effort.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES iv

SUMMARY v

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION: OBJECTIVES AND PLANS OF THE STUDY 1

II. DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY 6

III. PATTERNS OF STATE LIBRARY ACTIVITY 20

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 51

APPENDIX

A. QUANTITATIVE VARIABLES 59

B. QUESTIONNAIRE WITH FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION 62

C. THE ROLE OF STATE GOVERNMENT IN THE ESTABLISHMENT, PROMOTION AND SUPPORT OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES 72

REFERENCES 85

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	1968 State Appropriations Per Capita for Direct Library Programs. Variable 74.	20
2.	Per Capita Federal Grant Obligation, FY 1967. Variable 76.	24
3.	Change in State Library Program Appropriations from 1956 to 1968. Variable 82.	26
4.	Standards Typology. Variable 78.	28
5.	Standards and Appropriation Typology. Variable 79.	30
6.	Political Activity Typology. Variable 80.	32
7.	Perceived Influence of Library Professional Organizations Support on Final Appropriations for Agency	34
8.	Location of State Library Agency and Appropriation Support	35
9.	Final Approval for Budget Before Submission to State Legislature and Appropriation Support.	36
10.	Location of State Library Agency and Percent of Population Served by Public Libraries	37
11.	State Library Grants-in-Aid Distribution	37
12.	Grants-in-Aid and Environmental Variables	40
13.	Grants-in-Aid and Draftee Mental Requirements	41
14.	Grants-in-Aid and Education	41
15.	Public Library Income and 1968 State Library Agency Appropriations	42
16.	Factor I, Rank and Loadings > .199	44
17.	Factor II, Rank and Loadings > .199	45
18.	Factor III, Rank and Loadings > .199	47
19.	Factor IV, Rank and Loadings > .199	47
20.	Factor V, Rank and Loadings > .199	48
21.	Factor VI, Rank and Loadings > .199	49
22.	Factor VII, Rank and Loadings > .199	50

SUMMARY

The interest expressed by various Congresses in the past decade in the development of quality public library service for all Americans has resulted in a variety of federal legislation for libraries. This legislation has stimulated increased state and local support for the establishment and extension of libraries. To date, there has been no national study of library legislation involving specialists in government working with librarian specialists to evaluate state library legislation and policy.

This study sought:

1) To analyze current state library legislation in relation to a number of characteristics of the states, such as demography, economy, and governmental structure, to determine patterns of state-level legislation governing libraries;

2) To correlate information about legislation which provides present grants-in-aid support for library development and operation;

3) To describe and analyze the relationship of state support for libraries in the light of the information gained in 1) and 2);

4) To suggest guidelines for further legislative programs which could aid state library agencies and legislators in the continuing evaluation of legislation and aid programs.

To achieve these objectives, three categories of investigation were undertaken and completed:

1) A compilation and analysis of current state public library legislative policy and support level;

2) An investigation of the environmental relationships associated with variations in state public library policy and state support;

3) A review of the current status of state public library legislative policy coupled with recommendations for the modification of existing policy and the adoption of future policy.

A collection of data was gathered in two major categories: 1) full descriptive information about state library agency programs,

structure, finances, and policies; and 2) a large group of environmental variables to be analyzed for patterns of similarities or differences in the environment related to state agency data. Policy output analysis, a method of analysis used in the determination of state policy directions, was the analytical framework used to relate the expenditures of state library agencies to their respective operations. A variety of statistical procedures, described fully within the report, was employed to seek correlations between the environmental variables, state library agency information, and state legislation.

The results of the correlations revealed mostly low or moderate significance between state library program and environmental data. This limited significance is a major finding: the size of the library venture, in each state and for the country as a whole, is so small compared to other major public expenditures that policy output measurements do not indicate that environmental conditions place any real limits on the development of library activity.

This finding is a reflection of the specific, limited, yet commonly held role of libraries, in that this role is assumed to relate closely to education in terms of function, unique roles and services, and general educational responsibilities. The data show, however, that the small expenditures for state library functions, when related to the state's educational commitment, result in only a slightly positive correlation. The major implication of this finding is that concern for comparative "bigness"--i.e., comparable dollars, staff, resources--is not the answer. The alliance with education is more assumed than real, since the library portion, whether supported from the state educational department or as an independent agency, is unrelated to the large economic sweep.

The data analyzed in this study indicate that the twelve state library agencies presently operating within state departments of education are favorably situated as to financial support. This favorable position may be due to political sponsorship, the nature of the states which prefer this arrangement, or for other reasons. Additional study is needed of their administrative character, support, and political relationships for comparison with the majority of state library agencies not in state education departments.

There appears to be a valid future strategy for state library agencies to combine efforts with other state government ventures of a small funding nature--health, hospitals, recreation--since such programs appear to be more similarly structured financially to library activities.

The data showed a large gap between the availability of state grants-in-aid in state legislation, since only thirty-four states indicated such programs of aid, and the idea that a grants-in-aid program is a significant measure of the state's legal commitment to

the support of library development. The study revealed that the per capita income figure for the various states was evenly divided between states with and without grants-in-aid programs, indicating that such income, as a measure of the wealth or ability of states to pay for such aid, was not a basic restriction on the establishment of state aid programs.

Accepted lobbying procedures by state library agencies resulted in quality programs and higher appropriations. A state library agency could secure one or the other of these legislative policy goals, with only average political activity, but not both. Further, the data revealed that successful legislative library policy is secured when library professionals work with non-professional groups to influence political decision makers.

There appears to be no evidence from this study that state library legislation is patterned along common background characteristics of the states in terms of economics, politics, or social relationships. Mostly the legislation is alike in terms of permissiveness, service responsibilities, and fiscal limitations rather than in terms of individual state characteristics of income, population, educational level, and so on.

These recommendations emerged from the study and its conclusions:

1) A continuing study should be made of agency appropriations patterns to determine the role of state library services to state governments' increasing information and research activities.

2) Continuing review should be made of the grants-in-aid program's relationship to local (appropriations) for local services; legislation may be needed to either eliminate inequities or to provide a better sharing of responsibilities. Special reference to metropolitan areas and low income minority groups should be made in this effort.

3) The role of the state librarian in the state political process, within legal constraints, should be analyzed continuously as the state library agency proceeds to develop its statewide commitment. What should be the future role of the director in statewide library development, and what responsibilities for him should be stated in the law?

4) The relation between professional library organizations and other bodies which stand to gain from improved library services of all types should be studied in terms of potential legislative needs--interstate compacts, library network establishment, etc.

5) The size, quality, and conditions of employment of professional librarians in the state library agency, and as coworkers in the profession throughout the state, should be evaluated continuously and, if necessary, legislation should be sought to standardize personnel practices.

6) There is a continuing and desperate need for a central statistical clearing-house to provide uniform, up-to-date, and complete data for further research as well as to supply data on other library operations.

7) Library associations should sponsor workshops and develop manuals to provide guidance on securing political support for quality library programs.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: OBJECTIVES AND PLANS OF THE STUDY

In the past decade, various Congresses and the respective administrations have demonstrated a commitment to the development of quality public library service for all Americans, in all age groups and from all walks of life. In the belief that libraries are indispensable to the processes of government, industry, research, and education, and to the cultural development of the nation, they have enacted legislation to stimulate increased state and local support for the establishment and extension of various types of library service. The national concern for identifying the proper roles of federal, state, and local government in providing for the educational, health, recreational, and economic needs of the people of this country suggests the significance of research to study state government of public libraries.

A proposal was made to the Library and Information Sciences Research Branch, U. S. O. E., at the suggestion of the Committee on Legislation of the American Library Association, for a study of state library legislation and policy in the fifty states.

There has been, to date, no national study of library legislation which has involved specialists in government or public administration, fiscal operations, and related areas, who have worked with librarian specialists to evaluate state legislation and policy. The existing literature on both the legislation and its resultant programs, except for the work of Ladenson, is the output of librarians concerned with individual programs and state plans. The Monypenny study[1] surveys the library functions of the states, but it is not directly concerned with library legislation.

A literature search in the field of state library legislation, for the years 1961-1967, reveals that there is little codification of existing legislation, or little interpretation of the growth of such legislation. Ladenson's reference volume, American Library Laws, 3rd edition, (Chicago, A.L.A., 1964, and supplements) is the master compilation of information on all state library legislation,

---

[1]Phillip Monypenny, The Library Functions of the State (Chicago: American Library Association, 1966).

but it attempts no analysis. Most of the writings on library legislation are concerned with information about and interpretation of federal legislation. This level of laws is extremely important, of course, but such literature does not provide information about the similarities and differences in resultant state legislation, nor does the literature attempt to give the needed interpretation of trends and developments at the state level. The Bowker Annuals present information about aid programs within the states in summary financial form, but again these data do not attempt interpretation or synthesis. From this review, it appears evident that the study proposed here would be unique and useful in providing information not now available.

The need for the study is even more evident when it is realized that in each successive year legislative bodies in many states attempt legislative revision. The revisions have provided, generally, for new approaches to state aid programs, development of statewide systems of library service, and other elements of legislative direction toward improved quality of service. In many cases, such legislative change has come about as a result of comparison with a limited number of existing programs rather than through broad analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of current legislation which has resulted from differing conditions in the states.

Since more than thirty states now have some form of state aid legislation for public libraries, and in these states there is constant attention to the improvement and enlargement of their programs, the results of the proposed study could be most helpful in their activities. For the remaining number of states which have yet to enact such state aid programs,[2] the results of this proposed research could be most helpful to their future legislative proposal and accomplishments.

The study entailed the joint efforts of the Political Research Institute (formerly Institute of Governmental Research) and the School of Library Science, The Florida State University. The objectives stated for the study were:

1) To analyze current state library legislation in relation to a number of characteristics of the states, such as demography, economy, and governmental structure, to determine patterns of state-level legislation governing libraries;

2) To correlate information about legislation which provides present grants-in-aid support for library development and operation;

3) To describe and analyze the relationship of state support for libraries in the light of the information gained in 1) and 2);

---

[2]The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information, 1967 (New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1967), pp. 156-160.

4) To suggest guidelines for further legislative programs which could aid state library agencies and legislators in the continuing evaluation of legislation and aid programs.

The primary responsibility for the research procedures was assumed by the Political Research Institute (PRI). Three broad categories of investigation were proposed:

1) A compilation and analysis of current state public library legislative policy and support level;

2) An investigation of the environmental relationships associated with variations in state public library policy and state support;

3) A review of the current status of state public library legislative policy coupled with recommendations for the modification of existing policy and the adoption of future policy.

The following paragraphs elaborate upon each of these activities.

(1) The status of current policy and support. The initial thrust of this project was directed toward updating the existing compilation of state legislative policies. Dr. Alex Ladenson served as a consultant for this purpose. Political Research Institute surveyed the relevant state agencies in the nation by mail and telephone to determine present levels of state financial support for public libraries. The information then was coded and arranged in a typology. The typology was designed to provide comparative data upon policy and support levels pertinent to public libraries.

Three major classifications were envisaged in the fifty-state typology: a) financial support; b) structural configuration; and c) state standards. Since all research designs must allow for sufficient flexibility to meet unforeseen problems and information, these classifications were generally viewed as they had relevance to public libraries within the framework of these lines of inquiry:

a) Financial support: To determine the extent and structure of such support, the following questions guided the investigation:

1) What is the current status of state financial support to public libraries in terms of direct appropriations and state grants-in-aid?

2) What bases are utilized to distribute state support to local public libraries? (A review of equalization formulae, kinds of aid, etc., was included in this category.)

3) What relationship, if any, exists between state legislation and support for state library agencies, and state legislation and support for local public libraries?

4) What relationship, if any, exists between direct and indirect forms of state aid to local libraries?

The data collected from these findings was to be used as a separate measure to develop a scale providing comparative, standardized ratings of the states in terms of their financial support of public libraries.

b) Structural configurations, and c) state standards: To determine the nature of the relationships between policy, administration, and standards, data were collected which helped answer these and other questions:

1) What patterns of the state administrative structure relevant to public libraries can be identified in the states?

2) What intergovernmental trends relevant to public libraries can be discerned? (Specifically, what has been the relationship between federal legislation and aid to state legislative policy and state public library expenditures?)

3) What has been the role of the states in the development of personnel and other standards for public libraries?

4) Can nonfinancial state legislation be utilized to classify the role of the various states in public library development?

5) To what extent have state standards been mandatory or permissive, and what use has been made by the states of time factors for compliance to standards?

The relevant data were arranged into a scale which orders the complexity of state standards related to library legislation.

(2) State environmental conditions and their relationships to public library policy and support. The second stage of this design was undertaken after the collection of the basic data and the development of the rating scales. The methods utilized are modeled on those in current use by political scientists in policy output analysis research.[3] Such research has sought primarily to explain the

---

[3]Chapter Two, on Data Collection and Methodology, defines further this type of research.

relationship of measurable state policy decisions to other variables to determine, if possible, which variables explain differences in state policy outcomes. Most of the attention thus far focused upon policy outcomes has been directed toward state expenditure patterns in welfare, highway and educational appropriations, as these three areas are universally the areas of greatest state expenditure.

This procedure provided a test for the existence of patterns related to state public library expenditures and policies in the nation. The technique is also applicable to other units of government, such as counties and cities. This project does not encompass such application; but if the findings of this project prove useful, it could provide the impetus for such applications by other interested researchers.

(3) Review of the status of library legislation, with recommendations. The final section of the study synthesizes the previous findings so that the report will present some directions for future legislative action.

An Advisory Committee has guided the study from its inception and the Committee has served as consultants during two visits to the Florida State University: the Committee on its first visit, early in 1969, helped describe the limits of the questionnaire and the questions to be asked of the fifty state librarians; in late 1969, the Committee reviewed the initial findings of the study and provided valuable reactions most useful in the preparation of this report. The Advisory Committee members are: Mr. Edmon Low, Professor, Department of Library Science, University of Michigan; Mrs. Carma R. Leigh, State Librarian, The California State Library; Mr. Charles E. Reid, Mayor, Borough of Paramus, New Jersey; Mrs. Sara K. Srygley, Professor, School of Library Science, Florida State University; Miss Nettie B. Taylor, Director, Division of Library Extension, Maryland State Department of Education. The consultants are: Miss Germaine Krettek, Director, American Library Association, Washington Office; Dr. Alex Ladenson, Librarian, Chicago Public Library, and Mr. Robert H. Rohlf, Director, Hennepin County Library, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

CHAPTER TWO

DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY

Data Collection.--To carry out the study of State Library Legislation, data were needed in two major categories. First, a collection of data was sought that would permit a descriptive analysis of the state library agency program for each of the 50 states, including its relationship to the state public library program. Several typologies of libraries, based on such factors as structural differences, level of financial support, or the method of assistance extended to the public libraries, were developed from these data. The second category of data was composed of factors descriptive of the states' environments--physical, political, and socio-economic--again leading to a pattern of states grouped on the basis of similarities of characteristics. These basic data were needed for testing hypotheses developed in this study that variations in the states' environments influenced the development of the varying state library programs among the states. In seeking the library data, the researchers faced two related problems: first was the absence of comparable statistics covering operating information for state library agencies or for the operation of public libraries within the states. The wide variations in state library agency programs made standardization of the data collected very difficult.

For larger programs of government, particularly those with a long history of federal funding such as the welfare program, the terminology, functions, and statistical reports have long been standardized; data reported for the welfare function from the 50 states, for example, is readily available for comparative purposes. In using such data the researcher has the reasonable assurance that the different figures are descriptive of the same program or function within the state. For smaller program operations, such as the library program, there is no single agency that collects comprehensive and standardized statistics of the state and local governments carrying on this function in the 50 states.

A second problem, related to the first, developed in seeking comparable data over a period of time in order to examine changes in the environment with changes in the library program or library support by the state. Changes in terminology and record-keeping, along with changes in personnel responsible for program operation,

and in some states, organizational changes resulting from statewide reorganization, made the collection of comparable data over a period of time very difficult.

Data on the state library operations came from several sources. The publication of the American Library Association, American Library Laws, 3rd ed., the First and Second Supplements, and materials for the proposed third supplement (1967-68), furnished by Dr. Alex Ladenson, editor of the works, provided the basis for the descriptive analysis of the libraries based on state legislation.

A questionnaire survey of the State Library Agency Directors provided the major source of information gathered on library structure, policy, operational procedures, state support, and the perception of the librarians on factors influencing the development of the programs. This questionnaire was mailed in May, 1969, but it was not until December that the final (50th) return was received. [The questionnaire is reproduced as Appendix B of this report.] Many of the librarians spent much time in locating the requested data, but for some items the returns were negligible, thus limiting the usefulness of these particular items in the questionnaire. Item 12, on the functions carried on by the State Agency, was analyzed in conjunction with the Report of Library Appropriations in the Book of the States, 1968-1969. This report was also useful in verifying the annual appropriations figure (as shown in item 18), so that functional activities considered comparable among the states were examined.

The data in the questionnaire were also used as a check on the analysis of library structure and detailing of functions and procedures as taken from The American Library Laws, Supra. Legal requirements or provisions are not always adhered to in practice, and this study was concerned with the policy as it existed.

Supplemental information on state library operation of public library activities were also sought from the U. S. Office of Education. Henry Drennan, Library Science Branch, U. S. O. E., kindly provided statistics on finances of public libraries in the various states for the latest available year, 1962. Additional data on public library operations within the state were developed from reports in the American Library Directory published biennially by R. R. Bowker. In using this source as a basis for public library income for 1967 (or 1966), it was necessary to analyze the report for each state excluding or including, as the case might be, particularly itemized data relating to federal grants or other incomes.

None of these remarks should be construed as a criticism of the published data on libraries or as an apology for the collection of data developed for this study. These comments do, however, point out the need for the library profession to recognize its lack of

comparable data and the need for developing such information on library programs and operations as a preliminary essential in any attempt to develop standards or criteria of operations for its programs. Available data from other states should also be of use to librarians seeking support for functional activities or expanding their programs in relation to those existing in the other governmental entities.

A quantitative data collection made up the second category of information used in this study. Political scientists in recent years have turned to the influences of the environment in an attempt to explain variation of public policy for differing governmental units. The data bank as developed for the library study followed the model used by Professor Thomas R. Dye in his book, Politics, Economics and the Public: Policy Outcomes in the American States (1966). Because much of the data needed in this category is considered a standard statistic by the government agencies and reported to (or collected by) the federal government periodically, difficulties in gathering these data were minimal. For some items the latest available data are from the 1960 U. S. Census Report, but because of the large number of variables collected researchers were able to utilize several descriptive variables for each segment of the model developed. The kinds of quantitative variables examined and utilized in this study are listed as Appendix A.

Methodology of Policy Output Analysis.--In the last half decade, state expenditures have emerged as one of the major focuses of inquiry by political scientists and economists. The main thrust of this research, known variously as policy analysis, output or outcome analysis, and comparative state policy analysis, attempts to relate state spending statistics to other available quantitative state data. The nonspending variables deal with social, economic, and educational characteristics of the population in one category, political variables such as turnout, party competition, apportionment, and nature of the executive structure in another category. A third category includes other spending and taxing information. This study applies these techniques to state legislative policy on libraries.

The typical research design correlates quantitative variables in simple Pearson or partial correlation matrixes and upon occasion the variables have been factor analyzed. These techniques are explained at the end of this chapter. The purpose of these methods, of course, is to discover which variables produce the highest degree of interrelationship or loading. These results are then interpreted to account for the differences in amounts and patterns of state expenditures.

In the last five years a half dozen or so political scientists have published several books, over twenty articles, and have presented several papers on the subject of state expenditures as measurable policy outputs. A few economists and sociologists have also added to this productivity. Some of these practitioners claim much for this

development. It has been seen as a major breakthrough in the development of an incremental science of politics and as a key application of empirical systems analysis to a political system.[4] However, it is useful to offer the caveat that the current findings are primitive and preliminary. This observation is driven home by the fact that many of the findings from the recent state output studies are contradictory with one another. These contradictions have led to two schools of thought on the subject.

We will discuss the older of these two schools first because it was the first in the field and because its findings are more challenging to basic scholarly dogma among political science professionals. Essentially, the findings of this school maintain that state governmental spending relates more significantly to economic and social variables than to political variables.[5] Beginning with the legislative apportionment studies and moving to state expenditures as dependent variables, these researchers report consistent findings that maintain the primacy of environmental over political relationships. The kind of political measures which they report as not relating to state expenditures include data on voting turnout, registration, statewide political party competitiveness, legislative party competition, malapportionment, and gubernatorial strength. This list is not complete, but it gives a flavor of the types of variables that have been selected for inclusion in these studies. Examples of the statewide environmental variables typically selected for analysis in these studies are: per capita personal income, unemployment rates, educational attainment, persons living in places with more than 2500 people (urbanization), proportion of the population engaged in manufacturing, and almost any other similar type variables regularly reported by the United States Bureau of the Census.

---

[4] Thomas R. Dye, "The Development of Comparative Analysis in State Politics," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Gatlinburg, Tennessee, November 7-9, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

[5] Findings supporting the economic-environmental deterministic position can be found in the following works: Richard E. Dawson and James A. Robinson, "Inter-Party Competition, Economic Variables and Welfare Policies in the American States," The Journal of Politics, XXV (May 1963), 265-289. Thomas R. Dye, Politics, Economics and the Public: Policy Outcomes in the American States, (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1969). Thomas R. Dye, "Malapportionment and Public Policy in the States," The Journal of Politics, XXVII (August 1965), 586-601. Thomas R. Dye, "Governmental Sturcture, Urban Environment, and Educational Policy," Midwest Journal of Political Science, XL (August 1967), 353-380. Richard I. Hofferbert, "The Relation between the American States," The American Political Science Review, LX (March 1966), 73-82. To simplify terminology this group will be referred to as economic determinists in this report.

With some few exceptions, both in terms of studies and states, per capita income most often turns up as providing an important relationship to spending.

The main contribution of the economic deterministsw as in demonstrating that certain kinds of political variables, long thought significant to governmental policy, did not sustain a relationship to governmental expenditures. For example, such standard measures as median school years completed and per capita personal income did not correlate significantly with policy outputs.

The political deterministsconstitute the second of these two schools.[6] Ira Sharkansky has emerged as almost the sole contributor to the politically oriented policy output researchers. Using similar data and similar statistical routines Sharkansky gets very different results than those attained by the economic-environmental deterministsc. These differences proceed from the fact that while Sharkansky uses similar data to the other school, he does not use exactly the same data.

State spending variables, as defined by both schools, tend to deal with the same areas. They include total state spending and then spending broken down into subcategories such as education, welfare, and highways. The economic deterministsare fond of using expenditures in these areas from state and local sources while the political determinists seem to prefer using only state expenditures for these areas.

As mentioned above, Sharkansky prefers not to use combined state and local expenditures as a measure of state spending policies. He argues that the inclusion of local spending shifts the comparative basis of analysis away from the state as the prime unit. On the other hand the economic deterministsargue that in a program such as education where most of the money is local, it is most important to combine these spending sources. (Neither of the two groups of researchers seem to feel that federal contributions to state programs require

---

[6]Findings supporting the political deterministic position can be found in the following works: Andrew L. Cowart, "Anti-Poverty Expenditures in the American States: A Comparative Analysis," Midwest Journal of Political Science, XIII (May, 1969), 219-236. Ira Sharkansky, "Economic and Political Correlates of State Government Expenditures: General Tendencies and Deviant Cases," Midwest Journal of Political Science, XL (May, 1967), 173-192. Ira Sharkansky, "Economic Development, Regionalism and State Political Systems," Midwest Journal of Political Science, XII (February, 1968), 41-61. Ira Sharkansky, "Agency Requests, Gubernatorial Support and Budget Success in State Legislatures," The American Political Science Review, LXII (December, 1968), 1220-31. Ira Sharkansky, Spending in the American States, (Chicago: Rank McNally & Co., 1968).

consideration.) It is pointed out, moreover, that different practices in the nation with respect to the state-local distribution of effort masks the true impact of state spending on a program. For example, some states--largely in the northeastern region--make a very small contribution to local education, and in a correlation matrix such a practice hides the fact that local effort is much higher in these areas to compensate for the absence of state effort.

The results of this minor methodological shift are nearly disastrous for the economic analysts. Sharkansky reports that the economic and related measures not only lose their primacy as correlates of state spending when local spending is excluded, but also on many key variables the relationships are reversed and the coefficients are negative.[7] This is even more damaging than it appears on the surface, because the positive results that the economic deterministsh had secured were never very convincing. The obtained correlations were largely in the .40 to .50 range and were termed significant as a result of the application, or misapplication since sampling was not involved, of tests of significance. However, no matter what tests are implied, a .40 correlation explains only 16 percent of what there is to explain and a .50 correlation explains only about 25 percent of the variance. The earlier school holds fast to the combined local and state spending criterion, arguing that the output only has meaning if it measures the full effort. After all, they might say, it matters little to the child or his parents whether local or state government provides the money for the school in terms of the quality of the educational program.

Sharkansky has also made at least two positive contributions to the findings in the policy output area that must be noted. In both cases these support his basic contention that some political measures do relate to state spending. Most notedly he finds strong and continual relationships between current and past expenditures. In correlating expenditures for the states every five years from 1903 until 1965 only one correlation was as low as .43 and more than half of the correlations were in the .80-.90 range. A similar pattern prevailed, but with lower correlations, when 1965 expenditures were related to each of the ten previous five year intervals.[8]

Another political measure that Sharkansky has reported as relating to expenditures can be designated as budget strategy. This research did not pertain to all of the states and had some other methodological problems, but the results indicated that the approach deserved further testing. The study involved measuring the requested increases by state agencies against the governors' recommendations

---

[7] Ibid., 60-62.

[8] Ibid., 40.

and the final action of the legislature.[9] The findings reveal that spending increases at a greater rate for programs where agencies request larger than average increases and receive more than average support for those requests from the governor.

We could find no published refutation of Sharkansky's efforts to explain state spending in terms of political factors; however, we are informed that the reactions to the information of the relationships between current and previous expenditures has been largely of the "so what" nature. This criticism implies that, although the correlations are statistically significant, they are not substantively important. Such criticism argues that this technique does not explain the spending pattern and only moves the problem of explanation back in time.[10]

We could find no reactions to the evidence presented by Sharkansky that budget strategies account for some important portion of spending outcomes. However, this work is certainly open to questions about its methodological soundness on the grounds that it deals only with states that kept records compatible with the research design. Moreover, the economic determinists would certainly want to see these results after controlling, at least, for economic variables.

For the analysis of state library policy, we have attempted to avoid the separate problems of both schools by combining their techniques. We do this by using the variables and techniques of the older of the two schools as well as those of the new. We have data on state expenditures, income and taxation as well as combined parallel data from state and local governments. In this way we avoid the problems resulting from a shifting data base incurred by the earlier studies.

We account for the effects of change, or incrementalism, by adding twenty-two data items which measure the changes occurring on these items between 1961 and 1967. Seven of these items relate to social and economic characteristics of the states (population, employment, income), five to political characteristics (election margins, election turnout), five relate to revenue and taxing policies, and five to expenditure policies.

The budget strategy approach suggested by Sharkansky is incorporated in the Guttman scales which attempt to measure the political strategies of state library agencies. These scales will be explained in more detail at a later point in this report.

---

[9] Ira Sharkansky, "Agency Requests, Gubernatorial Support and Budget Success in State Legislatures," The American Political Science Review, LXII (December, 1968), 1220-31.

[10] Glen W. Fisher, "Review of Spending in the American States," The Journal of Politics, XXXI (August, 1969), 848-851.

Description of the Quantitative Variables.--The original quantitative data pool for this portion of the study consisted of 278 separate statistical items or variables. This first collection of variables was taken from over twenty-five published sources and several unpublished sources. This is probably the largest collection of social, economic and political data thus far collected for an output analysis study.

The first step in processing this massive data pool was data reduction. The purpose of the first reduction step was to winnow out variables that could have no effect on the purposes of the study. This step occurred twice prior to the final data processing. Using preliminary library and other state governmental figures, the pool was reduced to less than 100 variables indicating any possible impact with state library policies. After more detailed library data was available from the questionnaires, this procedure was repeated which resulted in a pool of 50 items. Of these 50 items 22 items could be compared to similar variables measured at an earlier time. For example, among the final fifty variables was General State and Local Revenue Per Capita for 1967. It was possible to secure this same information for earlier years in order to measure the effect of change on our findings. The year 1961 had been selected as the earlier test period so the 1961 counterpart was entered into the data bank and subtracted from the 1967 variable. This difference provided us with a new variable: General State and Local Revenue Per Capita, Change 1961-67. In all, twenty-two such change variables were recalculated and placed into the final data bank. To this group ten additional variables based on library related information were added. These included updated library expenditure data, local public library information and key variables taken from or recalculated from the project questionnaire. Consequently, the final quantitative data pool consisted of 82 variables. (These variables are listed as Appendix A.)

Eight of the final variables dealt with population matters such as general state population, population density and degree of state urbanization.

Economic concerns were primary in nine variables including such items as state per capita income and employment categories.

The degree of political party competitiveness was measured by ten variables. These gave the party vote for governor and each house of the legislature for various years in each of the fifty states.

Forty of the variables provided information on state and local governmental finance. This was by far the largest group. Combined state and local expenditure items included such information as total expenditures and subtotal expenditures for such groups as education, libraries, health, welfare and hospitals. Similar items

for state spending in these areas were included. Highways and some other large spending areas were eliminated at the data reduction stage. Revenue measures encompassed variables on total revenue, revenues from various tax sources and revenue from the federal government. Revenue variables for just state revenue, as well as combined state and local revenue were included. Seven of the total government finance items were library expenditures and three of these concerned expenditures for local public libraries.

All seventy-nine of the above variables were either stated as absolute numbers, per capita figures or percentages. This permitted them to be classified and treated as quantitative data.

The final three variables, along with the library expenditure variables, are the key or dependent variables of the project's quantitative data section. This means, that the other variables, the independent variables, are viewed as possessing the influence to change the value or position of these key variables.

These subjective variables are drawn from subjective qualitative information provided by the questionnaires returned from the state library agencies. A common scaling technique, which will soon be explained, was utilized to transform this information into quantitative data.

Two of these three dependent variables are measures of state library programs that indicate some of the policies that state library agencies have or have not adopted. In that sense they are qualitative measures. They measure the presence or absence of an item rather than the degree to which an item is present. The third variable is similar in nature but it concerns the type of political activity which state library agencies do or do not engage in to accomplish their policy goals in respect to state officials such as governors or legislators.

One of these variables measures activities which the library advisors to this project identified as reasonable current standards by which the quality of state library agencies might be judged. These standards were identified prior to the collection of data so that questions concerning them could be included on the questionnaire. From the identified standards six were selected for inclusion in the Standards Typology Variable. These six included the following:

1) The presence of a state grant-in-aid program to public libraries coupled with an equalization distribution principle.

2) The completion of a master plan for state library development.

3) The practice of relating budgetary requests to the master plan.

4) Evidence of the development of new programs by the state library agencies.

5) The requirement that professional personnel have secured professional library training.

6) Indication that research relating to library programs is utilized by the library agencies.

The second of these variables takes into consideration the degree of appropriations success secured by state library agencies. The same six items above are also included in this Standards and Appropriation Typology Variable. However, it also includes a seventh item based upon the per capita appropriation secured by the state library agency from the legislature during the 1968 fiscal year. Only appropriations for direct library expenses were included in this accounting.

The third of these variables is the Political Activity Variable. Information for this variable was also drawn from the questionnaire responses. This variable measures the presence or absence of certain political activities utilized by state library agencies to secure their policy goals. The political activities which were included are:

1) The practice of working with professional library organizations to achieve library policy goals.

2) The practice of cooperating with other interest groups to achieve library policy goals.

3) Evidence that the library agency has secured the active assistance of at least one political influential to secure its policy goals.

4) Formal representation from the state library agency at legislative and budgetary hearings concerning its operations.

5) Evidence that the state library agency maintains informal contacts with legislators or the other influential state political leaders.

In order that these three variables could be treated as quantitative data it was necessary to convert them from nominal into ordinal data. Simply put, what this means is that the data from the questionnaires indicated that state agencies had a quality or did not have a quality but not how much of it. The project required at this point more than the ability to say that one state was different from another--it was necessary to be able to say how much different. The Guttman scaling technique was utilized to accomplish this. Guttman scaling of the items in the three typologies permitted stating that one state was doing more or less of these qualities.

Guttman scaling is an old technique but its utilization to policy output analysis is getting its first application in this project. It takes policy output analysis one step further in its treatment of qualitative applications.

The Guttman process ranks the subjects, in this case state library agencies, from highest to lowest or most positive to least positive on the items selected for inclusion in the scale. In this case the states were ranked in their degrees of likeness. The Political Activity Variable will be used for an example. The state that ranks highest on the five political items is the one that gave the greatest number of positive responses to the political items and the state which ranks the lowest is the state which provided the greatest number of negative responses to those five items. Many states will tie--that is do, say, three of the five items. These items are broken by ranking the five items in order of their greatest difficulty for the state to accomplish. Difficulty is determined by the number of states which respond positively to an item. The item with the most negative responses is considered the most difficult. This two way ranking of subjects permits listing the states from 1 to 50. It is these rankings, from 1 to 50, that provide this study with its necessary quantification of what are basically qualitative positions.

It is possible that position on a Guttman scale could occur by chance rather than by means of a meaningful order. Two statistical tests are used to measure this possibility: Coefficient of Reproducibility (CR) and the Minimum Marginal Reproducibility (MMR). The closer the CR calculates to .50 and the MMR to 1.0 the greater the possibility that the rankings are merely random chance. The very rare, almost non-existent, perfect CR is 1.0 and MMR, .50. These tests calculated as follows on these three Guttman Scales:

	CR	MMR
The Standards Typology Variable	.86	.59
The Standards and Appropriation Typology Variable	.79	.53
The Political Activity Variable	.92	.70

In each case the spread between the two scores is sufficient to ignore the possibility that the ordering was due to pure chance.

Explanation of Statistical Procedures.--The Advisory Committee to this study suggest that this report would be more useful if it contained explanations of the statistical methods upon which the reports findings are based.

Correlation.--This section attempts to provide that explanation for correlation (symbolized by r). The findings following this explanation are based upon correlation and readers familiar with this statistic will want to proceed directly to that section.

In this report correlation is used to indicate the relationship of each one of the quantitative variables to each of the other 81 variables. For example, correlation can measure the relationship, if any, between 1968 state appropriations for library programs and state population. In this case if the least populated state appropriates the least for library programs and the next smallest state appropriates the next smallest amount for library programs and that pattern persisted for the remaining 48 states, there would be a positive correlation between population and state appropriation for library programs. If in each state the relationship were proportional to population, e.g., each state appropriated 50¢ for each person in the state for library programs, the correlation relationship between population and library programs would be perfect. It would also be perfect if the relationship were reversed. This would mean that the largest state, using the previous example, appropriated 1¢ per person, the second largest state appropriated 2¢ per person and on down the line of states in this manner until we get to the smallest state which would have to appropriate 50¢ per person. The correlation is still perfect, but negative. (It is perfect from the point of view of statistics, not from the point of view of libraries in the largest states.) The negative relationships mean that as population decreased, state appropriations increased. The perfect correlation is present but it is inverse. If there is no pattern based on population there is no relationship, or technically any relationship between population and state appropriations is the result of chance.

The number which measures the relationship is called the coefficient of correlation. The nature of the formula for arriving at this number permits the coefficient to vary between 1 and -1. Thus 1.0 (or 1) indicates a perfect correlation, as in the case of each state appropriating 50¢ per person for library programs. The perfect negative correlation, as in the case of 1¢ per person in the largest state and so on up to 50¢ per person in the smallest state, would compute to -1.0 (or -1). The completely chance relationship computes to .0.

In fact, perfect correlations almost never occur. Thus the coefficients--the number which states the degree of the relationship between the two variables--are almost always decimals. The actual coefficient for our example was computed to be .224, or r = .224. This is a summary statistic for all 50 states. It tells us nothing about the behavior of any single state. It does indicate that all 50 states, as a group, show a slight relationship between population and legislative support for library programs. However, the .22 correlation accounts for little influence on state appropriations.

We can account for its influence by multiplying the coefficient by itself (taking its square). This produces a produce of .0502. This indicates that of all the variance between state library appropriations and virtually everything else (whether in our 81 other

variables or not) which could explain state library appropriations, population accounts for just 5 percent of the explanation. That is something but not very much. How high does a coefficient have to get to explain an important part of the variance? We really do not know. Statistics has not yet advanced that far, but over the years subjective interpretation has provided some conventions or guidelines for users of these statistics.

Users of correlation who work with highly precise data that is expected to relate to strong theory so as to suggest a relationship would probably use the following:

$\underline{r}$ = .0 to .20 indicates no correlation
$\underline{r}$ = .20 to .40 indicates a low correlation
$\underline{r}$ = .40 to .60 indicates moderate correlation
$\underline{r}$ = .60 to .80 indicates marked correlation
$\underline{r}$ = .80 to 1.00 indicates high correlation

Social scientists are less demanding. Their data are normally not precise and theory connecting data is not highly developed in most of their area of concerns. In policy output analysis research concerning state governments, the coefficients rarely reach .60. Consequently, the convention we will adopt for this study will be of the following order:

$\underline{r}$ = .0 to .20 indicates no correlation
$\underline{r}$ = .20 to .30 indicates low correlation
$\underline{r}$ = .30 to .50 indicates moderate correlation
$\underline{r}$ = .50 to .70 indicates marked correlation
$\underline{r}$ = .70 to 1.00 indicates high correlation

These are fairly low, but it is fair to say that any relationship that can account for half of the total variation in social data ($\underline{r}$ = .70) is a high relationship.

Before moving on to the findings a few words of warning about correlations are in order. This section has not discussed the formula for computing correlation or the logic of the formula. Information of this type is available in any elementary statistics text. Second, correlation does <u>not</u> suggest causality. If the relationship between population and state library appropriations had been 1.0, that would not mean that large populations cause legislatures to spend more money per person for library programs any more than it would mean that spending more for libraries would create a population boom. After all, there is nearly a perfect correlation between the height of men and their pants length; but we cannot make men grow taller by giving them longer pants. Correlation can indicate only a joint occurrence, not causality. Finally, statistically correlations can be spurious. That is, they may relate mathematically but not meaningfully. For example, one researcher found a high relationship between

paved roads and infant survival. There was a joint occurrence but it was spurious. Most likely they related through a common factor such as technology or community resources. The problems of spuriousness and causality are in the realm of theory.

Factor Analysis.--Another statistical technique utilized at the end of the next chapter is factor analysis. Factor analysis is essentially a data reduction technique which reduces a group of variables by combining them into a lesser number. The computer program used in this study reduced the 82 variables to seven. Every variable appears in each of the seven factors and the relationship is indicated by a number known as a loading. Loadings vary from +1.0 to -1.0 just as correlation coefficients, and they are interpreted the same way. Factors are constructed variables, i.e. new variables put together out of old variables. The loadings indicate the degree of commonality of a variable to the factor. The variables with high loadings on the same factor have statistical commonality.

Factors are often given names by researchers on the basis of the common elements the researcher perceives in the factors. The factors in this report are not named to avoid misleading the reader, rather they are referred to as Factor 1, Factor II and so on. There are many approaches to factor analysis and it is a theory viewed by most statisticians with a good deal of caution. Even so, factor analysis is a strong tool which is constantly undergoing improvement.

CHAPTER THREE

PATTERNS OF STATE LIBRARY ACTIVITY

1968 Legislative Appropriations.--The set of correlations to be analyzed in this section relate to state legislative appropriations for library programs, variable 68. This information was taken from the questionnaire, checked against other reports and in some instances modified after conferences with appropriate state library agency personnel. Due to local practices and administrative rules, appropriations in some states may exceed expenditures. Appropriations for other agency services, such as the operation of legislative reference services and law libraries, were excluded. However, grants-in-aid for public libraries administered by state library agencies were included.

Key Section Findings

AMERICAN STATE LIBRARY APPROPRIATIONS ARE UNAFFECTED BY STATE RESOURCES. POOR STATES ARE JUST AS LIKELY AS RICH STATES TO HAVE HIGHER STATE LIBRARY APPROPRIATIONS.

Table 1.--1968 State Appropriations Per Capita for Direct Library Programs. Variable 74.

Rank	Variable Name	Variable Number	Correlation Coefficient r
1	State Upper House Majority Party Percentage, 1954-62	45	-.354
2	Federal Grant Obligations for State Library Agencies, FY 1967	76	-.348
3	State Lower House Majority Party Percentage, 1954-62	44	-.337
4	State Population Percentage Electing Majority of Legislators, 1955 Dauer & Kelsey Computation	35	.304
5	Vote Value in State's Largest County, 1960 David and Eisenberg Computation	36	.281

Table 1.--Continued.

Rank	Variable Name	Variable Number	Correlation Coefficient r
6	Urban Population, Percentage Change, 1950-60	54	-.279
7	Persons Engaged in Manufacturing, Change 1960-67	56	-.250
8	Democratic Percentage of State Upper House, 1966	12	-.241
9	Personal Income, Per Capita, Change 1960-67	57	.234
10	Public Library Expenditures, Per Capita, Change 1956-67	81	.229
11	Civilian Resident Population, 1968	1	.224
12	State & Local Revenues from Property Taxes, Per Capita, 1967	21	.218
13	Unemployment Rate, 1967	6	.214
14	State Health Expenditures, Per Capita, 1967	27	-.206
15	Total State General Revenue, Change 1961-67	69	-.204
16	Population Density	3	.203

The display in Table 1 shows the correlations of the library appropriation variable with any of the other 81 variables if the coefficient were .200 or greater. Sixteen variables related with 1967 library appropriations at that level, i.e. showed at least a low correlation. The other 65 variables showed no correlations that could not be attributed to chance.

The most immediate conclusion to be drawn from these correlations is the low degree of even the highest relationship. None of these correlations suggests even a moderate relationship to state appropriations for direct library programs. Moreover, these 80 variables were the residue of a total pool of 278 variables from which 206 were rejected as a result of early tests which indicated they had no promise of any meaningful relationship.

The highest correlation in Table 1, with a coefficient of .354, accounts for only 12 percent of the total variance. These low correlations suggest that state spending for library programs is largely unrestrained by the economic, social or political circumstances existing in the state. So far as these measures are concerned, any of the fifty states is in just as good a position as any

of the other states to receive either the highest or lowest appropriations. If library appropriations relate importantly to anything, that thing or things is not measured by the extensive group of variables utilized in this study.

There are some surprises in the weak relationships that did occur. The prior research in state output policy analysis has normally not produced relationships with political variables and state spending. However, four of the five highest correlations with state library spending are all political. These four, along with the eighth highest, probably interrelate. They suggest that library spending tends to be slightly higher in the more politically competitive two party states with legislative seats more fairly apportioned among the voters and where the Republicans do somewhat better in the upper legislative house, but only the upper house, than the Democrats.

The other item in the top six correlations is the 1967 federal grant obligations for state library programs. This variable is so central to the interests of this project that its analysis will be expanded upon in a separate section.

In addition to the political variables a group of demographic and economic environmental variables also exceed the .200 cutoff. These ranked 6th, 7th, 9th, 11th, 13th, and 16th. Three of them related through change: Urban Population, Employees Engaged in Manufacturing, and Personal Income. The first two of these are negative which indicates that there was a slight tendency for state library spending to lag in states undergoing rapid urban and industrial spending. States undergoing such change face a broad range of demands upon their fiscal resources. The strengths of these relationships will not support much speculation, but they do suggest that in the face of heavy new governmental demands library priorities are not highest on the list for legislative attention.

The small positive relation between Personal Income Per Capita, Change 1960-67, and state library appropriations is also quite low. Earlier output analysis studies most often stressed the absolute impact of this variable upon state spending, but they did not measure change. There was no relationship between absolute per capita income and appropriations in these findings. This suggests that personal income, alone, is neither a restraint nor a spur to state library spending. The fact that appropriations did relate to change in this variable from 1960 to 1967 suggests that, at least for this time period, there was an increase in library state funding which was somewhat related to an increase in per capita personal income, not to high personal income alone.

Although 1967 personal income did not attain a sufficiently high coefficient to be included in Table 1, a separate contingency analysis was made on this item. The states were ranked into two groups according to their level of personal income. Of the 25 states with

higher personal income, 11 were among the highest 16 in per capita library appropriations and seven were in the 16 lowest appropriation group. Five of the states in the lowest income group were ranked in the highest appropriation group and nine were in the lowest appropriation group. This does not alter our conclusion that a state's per capita income plays no significant role in the determination of state library expenditures.

The lowest correlating group of variables produced by these manipulations are also the most perplexing. They suggest that state library spending tended to increase in connection with a state's tendency to rely upon property taxes for revenue. They decreased as state expenditures for health increased and as state general revenues increased during the 1961-67 period. State library expenditures also tended to increase only slightly as public library expenditures increased from 1956-67. A correlation of the 1956 per capita expenditure of public libraries with the per capita income figure ten years later revealed no relationship between the two figures over a ten year period (r = .054). A similar correlation of state library agency appropriations over a 12-year period, 1956-1968, also revealed no pattern of development among the states in changes in expenditures (r = .096).

These relationships together, bearing in mind their low explanatory power, suggest that state to local grant-in-aid spending brought an increase both in minor local and state level spending for library programs. The other two relationships suggest that library expansion was not likely to occur in states with rapidly expanding general budgets or in the face of heavier than normal demands for health service. It may be that such programs must draw upon the same pool of civic-minded, middle-class types for support, and that if such political activists are giving one area immediate attention, other areas depending upon their support, such as libraries, suffer. For an explanation of the small relationship between state revenue reliance on property taxes and state spending we must turn to the nature of taxing procedures. Most states relegate property tax revenues to local governments. Those that do not, tend to shoulder more of the burden of local traditional government functions than those that do. While this is most often true of educational expenses, it may be true just often enough for library expenditures to account for this slight relationship.

Finally, it should be reemphasized that none of these relationships is strong enough to constitute any real restraint on state library programs.

Federal Grant Obligations for State Library Agencies.--This section deals with the funds allocated to State Library Agencies by HEW. Not every state utilized these obligations, but nonuse by a state was a voluntary action. Again, only two correlations with this item were moderate. Ten were low and the rest were unrelated.

Key Section Findings

NEITHER STATE RESOURCES NOR STATE LIBRARY PROGRAMS HAVE MEANINGFUL IMPACT UPON THE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL AID TO THE STATES.

Table 2.--Per Capita Federal Grant Obligations, FY 1967. Variable 76.

Rank	Variable Name	Variable Number	Correlation Coefficient r
1	Per Capita, State Library Agency Expenditures, 1968	74	-.348
2	Persons Engaged in Manufacturing, Change 1960-67	56	.312
3	State Upper House Majority Party Percentage, 1954-62	45	.295
4	State and Local Government Public Welfare Expenditures, Per Capita, 1961	38	.289
5	Per Capita, Total State and Local Federal Revenue, 1961	49	.289
6	Standards Typology Variable	78	.282
7	Registered Voter Participation Percentage in Gubernatorial Elections, Change 1954-62 to 1964-68	62	.262
8	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Gubernatorial Elections, 1954-62	46	-.259
9	State Upper House Democratic Percentage, Change 1954-66	58	-.254
10	State Population Percentage Electing Majority of Legislators, 1955. Dauer & Kelsey Computation	35	-.245
11	Personal Income, Per Capita, Change 1960-67	57	-.242
12	State Lower House Majority Party Percentage, 1954-62	44	.209

The highest correlation is the most puzzling. There was a tendency for the states with the lower 1968 library expenditures to receive the higher proportion of federal funds. Several possible explanations for this phenomena are suggested. There may be a funding bias in the federal procedure which leads toward federal

funding for the least adequately funded state programs.[11] A second possibility is that the federal funds are not large enough to motivate state agencies with better financed library programs to actively seek this assistance. A third possibility, and the one we consider most plausible, is in the nature of the states which have innovative library programs and low funding. This group could well be more aggressive in its pursuit of federal funding. It would be well, however, to look at the other correlations before further pursuing this question.

The pattern displayed by items ranked 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 can be disposed of quickly. These items related positively to 1968 state library appropriations. That relationship persisted in this group, with the items reversing to negative rather than positive values, because the 1968 appropriations related (negatively) to federal spending. The fourth ranked item, 1961 public welfare expenditures, is a secondary variable in the data pool. As a 1961 item it was included only to provide a base for measuring change. There is no ready explanation from the undisplayed correlations, nor is there a theoretical explanation, for its appearance here. Thus we conclude that its relationship in this correlation is spurious.

The sixth ranked item, the Guttman Standards Typology Variable, is moderate in its relationship; but it may be the key to explaining the federal funding pattern. It will be recalled that this variable was designed to measure the quality of state library programs in terms of innovation and formal professional personnel standards, but it excludes appropriation success. The typologies, including appropriation success, do not correlate with federal funding obligations. As a result, it is possible that federal funding success may be tied to the combination of low state library funding and high quality state agency programs when the latter is measured in terms of innovation and professional standards.

Change in State Library Spending.--The earlier discussion of state policy output analysis stated that one line of research maintained that current state spending was related to or predetermined by, in the less cautious words of some analysts, prior state spending. This report includes a test of that proposition for state library spending. The variable utilized for this test is the difference, by

---

[11] We are aware that LSCA allocation formula provides for heavier federal funding to states with lower per capita income, but state appropriations are not related to per capita income. (This correlation is .083.) Consequently, the income equalization principle in the formula does not account for the inverse relationship between 1968 state library appropriations and federal library grant obligations.

states, in state library spending between 1956 and 1968. The year 1956 was chosen because it was prior to the granting of meaningful federal support to library programs. The first test of this proposition flatly indicated that such incrementalism did not apply to state library spending. The correlation between 1956 and 1968 state spending was only .09. This is a very low correlation in the clearest area of chance.

Key Section Findings.

A HISTORY OF HIGHER APPROPRIATIONS DOES NOT GUARANTEE CONTINUED HIGHER APPROPRIATIONS. LOWER APPROPRIATIONS IN PRECEDING YEARS DO NOT PRECLUDE HIGHER CURRENT APPROPRIATIONS.

Whatever effect incremental spending has on other state spending, it does not affect library spending. It may be that the incremental explanation holds for the large state spending programs such as education, transportation and welfare but not for smaller programs such as library development.

However, the variable measuring change between 1956 and 1968 state library spending produced some interesting relationships with other variables. A glance at Table 3 shows that this variable revealed more relationships above the .200 cutoff than any of the other library spending variables and it produced higher correlations.

Table 3.--Change in State Library Program Appropriations from 1956 to 1968. Variable 82.

Rank	Variable Name	Var. #	Correlation Coefficient r
1	State Expenditure, Per Capita, for Health and Hospitals, 1961	47	.457
2	State Health Expenditures, Per Capita, 1967	27	.448
3	State Health & Hospital Expenditure, Per Capita, Change 1961-67	70	-.439
4	Persons Engaged in Manufacturing, Change 1960-67	56	-.416
5	State & Local General Revenue from Taxes, Change, 1961-67	65	.412
6	State Revenues Per Capita, 1961	41	.361
7	State Expenditure, Per Capita, for Hospitals, 1967	26	.329
8	Property Taxes as Percent of Total State and Local Tax Revenue, 1961	50	-.279

Table 3.--Continued.

Rank	Variable Name	Var. #	Correlation Coefficient r
9	State Payments to Local Governments, Per Capita, Change 1957-67	24	-.255
10	Total State & Local Government Tax Revenues Per Capita, 1961	40	.252
11	Total State & Local Government Revenues, Per Capital, 1961	48	.252
12	Population Density, 1960	2	-.251
13	State & Local Education Expenditure, Per Pupil, ADA, Change 1961-67	71	.249
14	Personal Income, Per Capita, 1967	10	.245
15	Total State General Revenue, Per Capita, 1967	25	.237
16	State & Local General Revenue from Taxes, 1967	20	.235
17	Total State & Local Revenues, Per Capita, 1961	39	.226
18	Total State & Local General Expenditures, Change 1961-67	67	.224
19	Unemployment Rate, 1960	5	.222
20	Total State & Local Educational Expenditures, Change 1961-67	68	.214
21	Population, Percentage Change, 1960-68	52	.212
22	Public Library Income, Per Capita, 1967 (Federal funds excluded)	77	-.205

The test is lengthy so it will not be examined in detail. The reader can view the minor nuances for himself. The major points manifest a strong tie between change in state spending rates for health and hospitals and, to a lesser extent, general revenues, general expenditures and educational expenditures.

The negative nature of the 3rd ranked variable suggests that the changes in health-hospital and library expenditures are not parallel each year but the first three correlations suggest that legislative spending policies are never far apart, overall, on these programs. The educational and general revenue expenditure items are not surprising. They merely suggest a reasonable tendency for library programs to prosper or starve along with other state programs.

Library Standards Typology.--Once again the correlations are all quite low on this variable. This variable, as indicated earlier, was designed to measure innovation and professionalization in state

library programs without regard to legislative budgetary success. High states on this item were able to get legislative and administrative policies established that cost very little money, but which seem conducive to a good library program.

Key Section Findings

APART FROM APPROPRIATIONS, QUALITY STATE LIBRARY PROGRAMS APPEAR TO BE THE RESULT OF EFFECTIVE LIBRARY LEADERSHIP IN THE HIGHER RANKED STATES.

The low correlations suggest that any state library agency would be free to accomplish these goals, and that their accomplishment is largely an act of will upon the part of the state library leadership.

Table 4.--Standards Typology. Variable 78.

Rank	Variable Name	Var. #	Correlation Coefficient r
1	State Health & Hospital Expenditures, Per Capita, Change 1961-67	70	.335
2	State Health & Hospital Expenditures, Per Capita, 1961	47	-.310
3	Democratic Percentage of State Upper House, Average 1964-68	13	.298
4	Federal Grant Obligations for State Library Agencies, FY 1967	76	.282
5	Democratic Percentage of State Upper House, 1964	11	-.278
6	Public Library Expenditures, Per Capita, FY 1956	73	-.251
7	Public School Expenditures Per Pupil, ADA, 1967-68	28	-.253
8	Democratic Percentage of State Lower House, Change 1964-66	59	-.251
9	Public School Expenditure, Per Pupil, ADA, Change 1961-67	71	-.234
10	Registered Voter Percentage Participating in Gubernatorial Elections, 1962-68	17	-.233
11	Population Density, Change 1960-68	53	-.232
12	Public School Expenditure, Per Pupil, ADA, 1961-62	42	-.215

The correlations in Table 4 give some slight indication of the spending habits in the states that have accomplished a high rating on this variable. These states are apparently about average spenders on most state and local programs. They are, however, less than average spenders on public school education. In the 1961 era they lagged somewhat on spending for health and hospitals, but in the last few years they have been increasing their expenditures in these areas. These states ranked low in spending in 1956. However, by 1968 they were about average in public library spending. The low to moderate correlation on federal funds for library grants may suggest that these grants have spurred interest in public library spending in these states, and that the state library innovations have helped them secure these grants.

Several political variables turned up in this matrix. Their meaning is not entirely clear, but they seem to suggest that the states ranking high on this variable have been increasing in Democratic strength in the upper legislative house since 1964, but that Democratic strength in the lower house has been less than average in the same time period.

The only environmental variable that made the cutoff was a low negative correlation on increase in population density in recent years. This suggests an average population increase or decrease prevails in these areas and that there have been no great changes in the density mix in these states.

All of this supports the earlier assertion that success in building a quality state library program, but without more than average state funding, can be accomplished in any state if the library forces have the desire to secure such a program. Also states with quality programs, but average state funding, receive more than average federal support.

Library Standards and Appropriations.--This variable measured the same qualities as the preceding one but added a measure on legislative appropriations success. This change had an extensive effect upon the correlations; not one of the 12 correlations which made the .200 cutoff in the previous set did so in this tabulation. Moreover, this set produced the only high correlation in the lot, the correlation on the Political Activity Typology.

Key Section Findings

COMBINED SUCCESS ON FUNDING AND QUALITY STATE LIBRARY PROGRAMS CLEARLY REQUIRES POLITICAL ACTIVITY FROM LIBRARY PROFESSIONALS AND RELATED GROUPS.

With all of this change in the correlational pattern it is startling to discover that there is little change in the distribution of the high and low states across these two standards measuring

variables. Of the 16 states attaining the highest ranking on the standards without the appropriations variable, 12 are also in the top group when appropriations are added. In the low group 11 states appear among the bottom 16 for both groups. However, there are many changes of rank in these groups and this helps account for the drastic change in the nature of the correlations.

The most striking finding in Table 5 is the clear and high correlation between success on this variable and the political activity of the state library agencies. Library agencies which practice normal lobbying procedures also secure high ratings on the combined measure of quality library programs and fiscal success. The correlation between political activities, of a lobbying nature, is related to the attainment of library legislative goals. Moreover, the fact that success in securing higher than average appropriations is not tied to political activity is equally startling. The r on that relationship was only -.161. We have just seen that policies for a quality program without appropriations can be attained without notable political activity. The r for that relationship was -.067, which is a pure chance relationship.

Table 5.--Standards and Appropriation Typology. Variable 79.

Rank	Variable Name	Var. #	Correlation Coefficient r
1	Political Activity Typology	80	.887
2	Urban Population, Change 1950-60	54	.378
3	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Presidential Election, 1964	33	-.295
4	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Presidential Election, 1968	32	-.293
5	State Welfare Expenditures, Change 1961-67	72	-.289
6	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Gubernatorial Elections, 1954-62	46	-.271
7	Personal Income, Per Capita, Change 1960-67	57	-.253
8	Population Percentage, Change 1960-68	52	.252
9	Public Library Income, Per Capita, FY 1967	77	-.249
10	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Congressional Elections, 1962	30	-.223
11	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Congressional Elections, 1958	31	-.212
12	Registered Voter Participation Percentage in Gubernatorial Elections, Change 1954-62 to 1962-68	62	.212
13	Percentage Engaged in Manufacturing, 1967	8	.212

Apparently state library agencies can get money without reasonable lobbying or they can get program without it. But getting money and program from the legislative policy process seems to require a meaningful political lobbying style.

It might be well to repeat, at this point, what political activities are utilized by states ranking high on the political activities variable. Library agencies with such ratings worked with library professional organizations to attain their legislative goals, appeared at formal legislative and/or budget hearings, maintained informal contacts with legislative and/or influential state political leaders, and secured the assistance of at least one political influential to help attain their policy goals.

Thirteen of the 50 states reported that they did all of these things and every state engaged in at least one such action.

The strength of this relationship makes the others appear insignificant, but there are some interesting patterns in the lower correlations of Table 5. A major point is the absence of any relationship to federal funding which was previously discussed.

The Standards and Appropriations Typology shows low correlations with only two spending variables. One is a low correlation with a six year increase in state welfare expenditures and the other is a low negative correlation with current public library spending. Apparently state success on this typology does not depend upon other state spending patterns or upon a stronger than average public library program.

In terms of the environment, success in this area does relate narrowly to increased urbanization, population growth and manufacturing rates but not to per capita personal income increase.

Politically the successful states on this variable demonstrate a little higher than average participation in gubernatorial elections but lower than average participation in Presidential and Congressional elections.

Apparently the political and population situations in these states move slightly toward instability but not enough to mute the major finding of this variable--the relationship between legislative policy success in terms of the program-appropriations combination and state library agency political action.

The State Library Agency Political Activity Typology.--Most of the impact of this significant variable was discussed in the preceeding section. However, in spite of the repetition between Tables 5 and 6 additional comment is provided. It was felt that, due to its high correlation with the Standards and Appropriation Typology, the full relationships of the Political Activity Typology should be displayed and discussed.

Key Section Findings

POLITICAL ACTIVITY CAN BE SUCCESSFUL IN ANY STATE. STATE LIBRARIES PROVIDING GOVERNMENTAL SERVICES FARED NO BETTER THAN THE OTHERS.

Most of the variables which made the .200 cutoff in Table 6 also appeared in Table 5. Only two did not appear in the previous discussions. It is assumed that the jointly appearing variables, with their almost similar values in the two sets of relationships, are interrelated and require no attention on this variable.

Table 6.--Political Activity Typology. Variable 80.

Rank	Variable Name	Var. #	Correlation Coefficient r
1	Standards and Appropriation Typology	79	.887
2	Urban Population, Percentage Change, 1960-68	54	.314
3	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Gubernatorial Elections, 1954-62	46	-.259
4	Population Percentage, Change 1960-68	52	.244
5	State Welfare Expenditures, Change 1961-67	72	-.239
6	Registered Voter Participation Percentage in Gubernatorial Elections, Change 1954-62 to 1962-68	62	.238
7	Vote Value in State's Largest County, 1960 David & Eisenberg Computation	36	-.228
8	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Congressional Elections, 1962	30	-.216
9	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Presidential Elections, 1964	33	-.213
10	Personal Income, Per Capita, 1960	9	-.211
11	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Congressional Elections, 1958	31	-.210

The 7th ranked variable (No. 36), dealing with apportionment, in Table 6 barely missed the cutoff in Table 5. The correlation indicates that the higher ranking states on political activity were less well apportioned in regard to legislative seats than the average state in 1960. They then would have experienced some recent legislative modification as a result of the reapportionment phenomena of this decade.

The 10th ranked item (Variable No. 9), Personal Income, Per Capita, 1960, did not appear in the preceding discussion. This correlation suggests that states high on political activity had lower than average personal income rates in 1960. This was not the case for 1967 when the correlation between personal income and political activity was -.017 indicating an improvement in the income standing for citizens of these states during the past few years.

Both of these new variables strengthen the supposition put forward in the previous section indicating that high political activity, which results in the combination of program and appropriation policy success, has a tendency to occur in states undergoing some political change.

This supposition gains further support from a cross tabulation between library agency cooperation with nonlibrary interest groups and success on the Standards and Appropriation Typology. Of 25 states reporting support, 14 ranked in the highest group. By contrast with the 25 states not listing this support, only four ranked in the high category. The nature of the activity of the support group working for the library program made only a slight difference in the ranking of the states on the standard typology. The group reporting "contacting of legislators," as the basic activity, ranked slightly higher than did the group that indicated the group's activity was "seeking public support."

A separate cross tabulation was developed to measure the relationship of cooperation between state library agencies and professional library organizations to attain state library policy goals. This more traditional approach to the generation of support for library programs was not as successful as cooperation with nonlibrary interest groups. Political activity by professional library organizations had no apparent effect, by itself, on the appropriations for state library programs. The questionnaire asked library agencies to report their perception of the value of help from professional library organizations in attaining their goals. Table 7 indicates that agencies generally saw this help as more valuable than not, but that agencies with the highest appropriations realized the limits of such aid, as none of them said it was extremely valuable.

These two cross tabulations support the contention that success in the important effort to secure both good library programs and higher appropriations requires political action. Moreover, this action must include a combination of political techniques and cannot rely on the easy solution of only calling upon professional librarians for such aid.

Several political hypotheses held at the beginning of this study were disproved by the data gathered. Functional activities of

Table 7.--Perceived Influence of Library Professional Organizations Support[a] on Final Appropriations for Agency

States Ranked by Level of $ Appropriations	Extremely Valuable		Useful or Valuable		Unknown		No Value		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Low	20.0	(2)	50.0	(5)	0.0	(0)	30.0	(3)	100.0	(10)
Medium	33.3	(4)	25.0	(3)	41.7	(5)	0.0	(0)	100.0	(12)
High	0.0	(0)	58.3	(7)	33.3	(4)	0.0	(1)	100.0	(12)

[a]Two states did not respond to this item.

state library agencies involving service to political elites in the state, would, it was assumed, improve the ability of the agency to obtain support for its goals. This support would be evidenced by a higher appropriation level in contrast with those systems which did not have the benefit of such contact. The 28 states that reported allocations of resources for legislative reference service for the state legislature were almost equally divided among the three groupings of states in the level of the 1968 per capita appropriation. A similar examination of the appropriation ranking of the 24 states reporting operation of a law library also revealed an almost even division among the groups.

Structural Differences in State Library Agencies.--The location of a state library agency within the state's administrative organization varied. An examination of library support in the context of this organization indicated that state library agencies under the authority of library boards or commissions did not fare as well as those placed under the direction of another state agency. Twelve of the 50 states' agencies were located in the State Department of Education, one in the Office of the Secretary of State and the remaining 37 operated as independent state agencies or under the direction of some type of board. As seen in Table 8, over one-half (7 of the 13) of the agencies located under the jurisdiction of a larger state agency fell in the highest group of states when ranked by appropriation support. Only 24 percent (9 of the 37) located as independent agencies were in this higher appropriation group.

Patterned responses to two questions answered by the state library agency (Appendix B, questions 5e and 34) on the structural operation of the state agency, supported the findings shown in Table

Table 8.--Location of State Library Agency and Appropriation Support

State Grouped by Appropriations	Education Department & Secretary of State[a]		Other		Total
	%	N	%	N	
High	54.0	7	24.4	9	16
Medium	23.0	3	40.5	15	18
Low	23.0	3	35.1	13	16
	100.0	13	100.0	37	50

[a]Only the Illinois State Library is in the Office of the Secretary of State. In 1969 Florida placed its state library agency under the Secretary of State but the move was too late to affect this analysis.

8 above. Those states under the authority of a library governing board, as contrasted with those states in which the library agency operation was under the direction of an official, such as the governor, secretary of state, or superintendent of education, tended to fall in the group of states with lower per capita appropriations. Of the 33 states responding that the employment of the librarian was the responsibility of a library governing board, only seven were in the high appropriation group. Over one-half (9 of 17) of the group of agencies in which the librarian's employment was the responsibility of a state official (such as the governor, superintendent of education, etc.) fell in the top appropriation group.

On the second question, "What person or group has final approval of budget before submission to the state legislature?" again those states under the library governing board had a proportionately larger number in the lower appropriation group than states which were under the direction of the governor, other elected official or a combination of such persons. (See Table 9.)

Apparently in those states in which the library agency is located within the framework of a stronger political sub-system, i.e., under the direction of the governor or another political official, the bargaining power of the agency is strengthened as demonstrated by the relatively higher rank of these states in per capita appropriation.

Table 9.--Final Approval for Budget Before Submission to State Legislature and Appropriation Support

States Grouped by Appropriation $	Librarian or Library Board		Governor		Education Director		Other		Total
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
High	20	(1)	33.3	(6)	50.0	(4)	26.3	(5)	(16)
Medium	20	(1)	44.5	(8)	37.5	(3)	31.6	(6)	(18)
Low	60	(3)	22.2	(4)	12.5	(1)	42.1	(8)	(16)
Total		(5)		(18)		(8)		(19)	(50)

The existence of library advisory boards serving the state library agency was another structural difference in state library agencies which was examined in the context of library support. For those states using the advisory board, the pattern of fiscal support was higher but further examination of the boards in the environmental context revealed that these same states were characterized by a higher per capita personal income, a higher level of education for the population, lower unemployment rates and higher percentage of workers engaged in non-agricultural employment. It would appear that the advisory board is a refinement of library support in one stage of the state's economic and political development. One could hypothesize that the existence of an advisory board chosen from throughout the state would consist of influential members who would enhance the library program; however, this thesis would involve a study of the characteristics and political activities of the board members and is beyond the limits of this study.

The degree of coverage of the state by public library service was related to the location of the state agency within the state's hierarchy (See Table 10). Wider coverage was found in the states under the department of education. It is assumed that the association of education with public library services would encourage the integration of these two functions although, again, this data is not causal. Coverage also related positively to the population density of the state and to the economy of the state, i.e., the more prosperous and the more densely populated states also reported reaching more of their citizenry with library services.

State Grants-in-Aid Programs.--One phase of the analysis sought to identify and explain any existing patterns in the relationship between the activity and support level of the state library agency and

Table 10.--Location of State Library Agency and Percent of Public Served by Public Libraries

State Library Agency	Educational Department		Other		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
96 - 100%	66.7	(8)	44.7	(17)	50.0	(25)
58 - 95%	33.3	(4)	55.3	(21)	50.0	(25)
	100.0	(12)	100.0	(38)	100.0	(50)

Source: Calculated from data in American Library Directory, 1968-1969 (26th ed., New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1968).

that of the public library system within the state. Thirty-four of the 50 states reported programs of state grants-in-aid for the local public libraries. A report of the development of state grants-in-aid program by Dr. Alex Ladenson is included as Appendix C. The level of financial support varies widely among these states, however, and the methods used for determining such grants to the localities also varies widely. (See Table 11 following.)

Key Section Findings

DENSELY POPULATED STATES WITH LOWER EDUCATIONAL LEVELS WERE MOST LIKELY TO HAVE GRANTS-IN-AID PROGRAMS. OTHER STATE RESOURCES DO NOT AFFECT THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF SUCH PROGRAMS.

Table 11.--State Library Grants-in-Aid Distribution

State	1968 Agency Appropriation Including Grants-in-Aid	1968 Funds for State Grants-in-Aid		Method of Distribution[a]
		Total	Per Capita	
Alabama	$ 240,100	$ 100,800	$.028	B,E
Alaska	72,900	9,000	.037	E
Arizona	93,000	b		B,E
Arkansas	517,932	360,060	.179	A,B,C,E
California	2,458,626	800,000	.042	A,B,C,E
Colorado	580,172	400,000	.201	C,D,E

Table 11.--Continued.

State	1968 Agency Appropriation Including Grants-in-Aid	1968 Funds for State Grants-In-Aid		Method of Distribution[a]
		Total	Per Capita	
Connecticut	$ 1,081,592	$ 333,000	$.113	C
Delaware	118,900	33,740	.064	E
Florida	334,860	206,000	.034	A,B,C
Georgia	2,648,310[c]	2,433,990	.544	B,C,E
Hawaii	2,815,057[d]			E
Idaho	92,450			
Illinois	5,345,000	4,124,608	.377	A,B,C,D,E
Indiana	539,535			
Iowa	130,050			
Kansas	564,521			
Kentucky	1,500,000	165,000	.052	A,B,C,D,E
Louisiana	205,262			
Maine	245,348	18,498	.019	E
Maryland	2,734,155	2,467,678	.670	A,C,D
Massachusetts	1,466,022	1,255,242	.232	C,E
Michigan	2,227,783	1,217,500	.139	A,C,D
Minnesota	476,589	400,000	.109	A,B,C,D,E
Mississippi	237,500			
Missouri	687,195	473,027	.103	A,B,C,E
Montana	100,000			
Nebraska	95,719			
Nevada	254,963			
New Hampshire	320,272	35,500	.050	D
New Jersey	3,265,842	2,606,000	.372	C,D,E
New Mexico	460,000	20,000	.020	E
New York	17,000,000	14,470,359	.800	B,C,D
North Carolina	1,083,714	736,250	.146	A,B,C,E
North Dakota	87,200			
Ohio	568,146	317,757	.030	A
Oklahoma	182,209	b		E
Oregon	535,229			
Pennsylvania	5,098,379	4,958,212	.424	A,C,D
Rhode Island	644,993	214,872	.243	C,E
South Carolina	573,700	478,519	.183	C
South Dakota	90,992			
Tennessee	548,720	499,000	.126	B,C,D,E
Texas	424,418			
Utah	191,066			
Vermont	255,371	3,373	.007	E
Virginia	1,260,655	197,955	.044	B,C,D
Washington	675,743			

Table 11.--Continued.

State	1968 Agency Appropriation Including Grants-in-Aid	1968 Funds for State Grants-in-Aid		Method of Distribution[a]
		Total	Per Capita	
West Virginia	$ 275,000	b		C,E
Wisconsin	399,249	d	d	d
Wyoming	58,600	d	d	d

Source: From State Library Agency Questionnaires supplemented by data from The Book of the States, 1968-1969, p. 306.

[a]A - Equalization
B - Establishment
C - Per Capita
D - Area
E - Other special purpose grants

[b]No grants-in-aid funds reported for FY 1968.

[c]Includes funds for books and locally employed librarians.

[d]Integrated system includes state and public libraries.

States utilized the special purpose grant for a variety of purposes. In some states the agency was given discretion in determining the purpose and amount of such aid. In others, minimal incentive aid was offered such as a book collection, or a flat rate as reimbursement for books purchased during the year. Such income might be important in the very small municipal libraries, but for the library operating in a metropolitan area the state aid was not of any significance. Those states carrying on grant programs (regardless of the level of their effort), when contrasted with the group of states not reporting such support, had a larger proportion fall in the highest group of states ranked by per capita library agency appropriation. It would be assumed that a state extending aid to public libraries would be spending at a higher level than one not extending such aid, but the minimal effort made by some states would hardly skew the distribution.

The environmental characteristics of those states having grants-in-aid programs presented a different pattern from those states not reporting such operations. In states with a population density under 67 percent, only 12 of 25 states carried on a grants program. By contrast, 22 of the 25 states with a higher population density

reported grant programs. Similarly, more of the industrialized states carried out a program of grants-in-aid. The economic well-being of the state, measured by the per capita level of income, did not relate to the development of grant programs according to the findings seen in Table 12. This distribution was only slightly changed when analyzed against factors indicating level of family income, i.e. percentage of families earning above $10,000 and the percentage earning below $3,000.

Table 12.--Grants-in-Aid and Environmental Variables

Variable	Rank	Grants-in-Aid Program			
		Yes		No	
		%	(N)	%	(N)
Civilian Resident Population, 1968	Low	41.2	(14)	68.7	(11)
	High	58.8	(20)	31.3	(5)
Population Density	Low	35.3	(12)	81.3	(13)
	High	64.7	(22)	18.7	(3)
Percent Population Non-white	Low	55.9	(19)	37.5	(6)
	High	44.1	(15)	62.5	(10)
Unemployment Rate*	Low	52.9	(18)	37.5	(6)
	High	47.1	(16)	62.5	(10)
Percent Non-agricultural	Low	41.2	(14)	68.7	(11)
	High	58.8	(20)	31.3	(5)
Per Capita Personal Income	Low	50.0	(17)	50.0	(8)
	High	50.0	(17)	50.0	(8)

*The change in N for this distribution is caused by a tie among three states at the boundary between the low and high distribution.

A slightly different political pattern was found for those states carrying on grants-in-aid programs. More states in this group were controlled by a Democratic legislature and had a higher turnout for presidential and gubernatorial elections than those states not reporting a grant program.

Another difference between states operating and those not operating such programs was found in the pattern of educational level

of the population. Those states operating grant programs had populations with lower levels of education by two different measures as seen in the following tables.

Table 13.--Grants-in-Aid and Draftee Mental Requirements.

State Grants-in-Aid Programs	Percent of Draftees Failing to Meet Mental Requirements for Induction into Armed Forces, 1966					
	Up to 6.9%		7 - 30%		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	45.4	(10)	85.2	(23)	67.3	(33)
No	54.6	(12)	14.8	(4)	32.7	(16)
Total	100.0	(22)	100.0	(27)	100.0	(49)

Table 14.--Grants-in-Aid and Education

State Grants-in-Aid Programs	Percent of Persons 25 Years and Over with Less than Five Years of Education, 1960					
	Up to 6.4%		6.5 - 30%		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	44.0	(11)	92.0	(23)	68.0	(34)
No	56.0	(14)	8.0	(2)	32.0	(16)
Total	100.0	(25)	100.0	(25)	100.0	(50)

Furthering the search for relationships between the public library level of expenditure and that of the state library agency, the thesis was advanced that changes in expenditures among the state library agencies would correlate to some extent with expenditure change in the public library agencies within the state. The results

of the tests were negative: no relationship could be found through a simple measure of correlation of change. Contrasting these two variables (see Table 15) revealed an almost even distribution in the states when grouped by appropriation levels.

Table 15.--Public Library Income and 1968 State Library Agency Appropriations

Per Capita State Library Agency Appropriations 1968	States Grouped by the 1967 Per Capita Public Library Income (Excluding Federal Funds)							
	Low		Medium		High		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Low	31.3	(5)	31.3	(5)	33.3	(6)	32.0	(16)
Medium	43.7	(7)	37.4	(6)	27.8	(5)	36.0	(18)
High	25.0	(4)	31.3	(5)	38.9	(7)	32.0	(16)
Total	100.0	(16)	100.0	(16)	100.0	(18)	100.0	(50)

Cross tabulations indicate some relationship between public library spending in 1967 and state economic development. However, these relationships virtually disappear in the correlational analysis as correlation is a much stronger analytical tool than cross tabulation. Hence, we are forced to conclude that public library spending, like state level spending, is not influenced or restrained by state economic, demographic, or political environment.

Interviews with a few selected public librarians were conducted for the purpose of ascertaining the general climate of state-federal-local library relationships and problems, if any, as seen by the public librarians. For those librarians carrying out programs in sparsely populated areas and receiving aid through the state from the LSCA of the Federal Government, the program was highly praised. For larger library operations, particularly in metropolitan areas, reactions were mixed to the state agency activity and to the channeling of federal funds through the state agency. Some public librarians were most favorably impressed with the stimulating influence of the federal program throughout the state although their particular library might not have been a recipient of any funds. Others were critical of the projects funded in their particular states and questioned the judgement of the state agency staff in the allocation of funds for particular areas or groups. The metropolitan area librarians interviewed

apparently receive little or no benefit from the state library agency which may be smaller than the larger city library both in point of staff and of fiscal support.

The urgent plight of metropolitan areas in furnishing library services to rapidly expanding population concentrations, frequently composed of large segments of minority groups, was stressed by urban area librarians. This group feels particular emphasis should be placed on developing innovative programs and services to stimulate and meet needs of the underprivileged.

Librarians of both large and small units agreed that federal funding was needed to solve the problems of library service in a changing environment. The federal aid programs for public libraries won unanimous support from the state agency librarians as a catalyst in developing public awareness and support for library programs.

Epilogue to the Statistical Study

Factor Analysis Patterns.--The proposal for this project encompassed a factor analysis of the quantitative variables. A brief explanation of factor analysis technique was presented at the end of Chapter Two for readers unfamiliar with this statistic.

Key Section Findings

LIBRARY PROGRAMS ARE NO LONGER TIED TO PUBLIC EDUCATION. FACTOR ANALYSIS DOES NOT ALTER ANY OTHER FINDINGS.

Only 26 of the 82 variables were included in the factoring process. Any variable which did not produce at least one correlation with a library variable at the .200 level or higher was excluded from the factor program. This should increase the variance explained by the seven variables. Even so the variance explanation level is a low .400. Moreover, the outcome of this analysis produced very little in the way of new findings. However, the factors are presented here and briefly analyzed to clarify some minor points. The tables in this section display variables only when they attained a loading of .200 or greater on a factor.

The Standards Typology and 1967 Public Library Expenditure were positively loaded on the first factor. A third library variable, 1968 state library appropriations, was negatively loaded on the first factor. Moreover, the Standards Typology and the 1968 state library appropriation variable had their second highest loading on the first variable.

The dominant influence in the first factor is reflected in the four variables which measure the voting participation of all persons over 21. There is also indication of a favorable economic system in this group, as low 1960 unemployment and rising personal

Table 16.--Factor I, Rank and Loadings > .199

Rank	Variable Name	Var. #	Loading
1	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Gubernatorial Elections, 1954-62	46	.937[a]
2	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Congressional Elections, 1958	31	.928[a]
3	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Congressional Elections, 1962	30	.908[a]
4	Registered Voter Participation Percentage in Gubernatorial Elections, Change 1962-68	62	-.856[a]
5	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Presidential Elections, 1968	32	.797[a]
6	Unemployment Rate, 1960	11	-.707[a]
7	Democratic Percentage of State Upper House, Average 1964-68	13	-.549[a]
8	Urban Population, Change 1950-60	54	-.541[b]
9	Standards Typology	78	.478[b]
10	Public School Expenditures, Per Pupil, ADA, 1961-62	42	.389[b]
11	State Appropriations Per Capita for Direct Library Programs, 1968	74	-.386[a]
12	Population Percentage, Change 1960-68	52	-.379[b]
13	Public Library Income, Per Capita, 1967 (Excluding federal funds)	77	.325
14	Public School Expenditures, Per Pupil, ADA, 1967-68	28	.252[b]
15	Democratic Percentage of State Lower House, Change 1964-66	59	-.228[b]
16	Personal Income, Per Capita, Change 1960-67	57	.212[b]
17	Population Density, Change 1950-60	53	.203[b]

[a]Primary loading.
[b]Secondary loading.

income appeared here. However, the latter has a very low loading. The population picture on this factor suggests that states of stable or declining populations, but which are more densely populated than the average, figure in this factor. Finally, higher than average spending for public schools is related to this factor.

The 1968 state library appropriation variable has its secondary loading on this factor. However, only two variables tested here appeared in Table 1 as correlating with appropriations, Urban

Population Change and Personal Income Change. The coefficients on these relationships were low on the factor and the correlation.

The Standards Typology also had its secondary loading on this factor. Seven common variables appear in Table 4 (which carries the r's for the Standard Typology) and Table 8 but the correlations are all too low to provide any significant information.

In sum, Factor I says something about politics and almost nothing about libraries. Certainly there is nothing in this factor that would lead to a modification of any of the earlier findings on the library variables.

Factor II (Table 17) also produced library relationships. 1956 Public library spending--indicating traditional library strength--had a heavy primary loading on this factor. A secondary loading for 1967 public library expenditures also appeared on this factor. State library appropriations for 1968 and the Standards Typology appeared in the middle of the list. The library variables are well represented on this factor.

Table 17.--Factor II, Rank and Loadings > .199

Rank	Variable Name	Var. #	Loading
1	Public School Expenditures, Per Pupil, ADA, 1967-68	28	.883[a]
2	Public Library Income, Per Capita, 1956	73	.865[a]
3	Public School Expenditure, Per Pupil, ADA, Change 1961-67	71	.861[a]
4	State Health and Hospital Expenditures, Per Capita, 1961	47	.728[a]
5	State Health and Hospital Expenditures, Per Capita, Change 1961-67	70	-.727[a]
6	Public School Expenditures, Per Pupil, ADA, 1961-62	42	.709[a]
7	Public Library Income, Per Capita, 1967 (Excluding federal funds)	77	.420[b]
8	State Appropriations Per Capita for Direct Library Programs, 1968	74	.320
9	Population Percentage, Change 1960-68	52	.278
10	Standards Typology	78	.266
11	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Congressional Elections, 1958	31	.254
12	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Congressional Elections, 1962	30	.232[b]

Table 17.--Continued.

Rank	Variable Name	Var. #	Loading
13	Registered Participation Percentage in Gubernatorial Elections, Average 1962-68	17	-.220[b]
14	State and Local General Revenue from Federal Government, Per Capita, 1967	19	.227[b]

[a]Primary loading.
[b]Secondary loading.

Educational spending variables also appeared prominently as did 1961 states' health and hospital spending although, once again, increased health and hospital spending after 1961 produced a negative relationship. Three voter participation variables, one negative and two positive appeared, in this loading; as did a minor loading for the variable measuring an increasing percentage of the nation's population.

Due to the low loading of the library appropriations variable and Standards Typology this factor says little about state library programs. It does yield more on public library spending. A relationship between public library in the earlier time periods is indicated. In fact the r between 1956 public library spending and 1967-68 public school spending is a high .775. The same relationship for 1961 public school spending was .649. However, these relationships for 1967 public library spending were .064 and .365. This significant drop off indicates, as suggested earlier, that there is no longer the clear relationship between library and educational spending that formerly existed.

The third factor is displayed in Table 18, but we can allow this one to go unanalyzed as it did not include any library variables and only one minor state government variable.

Factor IV, given in Table 19, produced the primary loading for the Standards Typology and for 1967 public library spending, although the loading in each case was moderate.

These two library variables (Standards Typology and 1967 public library spending) related heavily to increasing state welfare expenditures, somewhat less heavily to decreasing urban population but within the framework of moderate population increases. The 1962 public school expenditure measure and unemployment in 1960 also had a low loading on this factor.

Table 18.--Factor III, Rank and Loadings > .199.

Rank	Variable Name	Var. #	Loading
1	Population Density, Change 1960-68	53	.903[a]
2	Personal Income, Per Capita, Change 1960-67	57	.889[a]
3	Registered Participation in Gubernatorial Elections, Average 1962-68	17	.762[a]
4	Democratic Percentage of State Upper House, Average 1964-68	13	.539[a]
5	Eligible Voter Participation in Presidential Election, 1968	32	.499[b]
6	Registered Voter Participation in Gubernatorial Elections, Change 1962-68	62	.360[b]
7	Unemployment Rate, 1960	11	.298
8	Public School Expenditures, Per Pupil, ADA, 1961-62	42	-.253
9	Urban Population, Change 1950-60	54	-.205

[a]Primary loading.
[b]Secondary loading.

Table 19.--Factor IV, Rank and Loadings > .199.

Rank	Variable Name	Var. #	Loading
1	State Welfare Expenditures, Change 1961-67	72	.634[a]
2	Standards Typology	78	.597[a]
3	Public Library Income, Per Capita, 1967 (Excluding Federal Funds)	77	-.594[a]
4	Urban Population, Change 1950-60	54	-.324[b]
5	Population Percentage, Change 1960-68	52	.280[b]
6	Public School Expenditures, Per Pupil, ADA, 1961-62	42	.270
7	Unemployment Rate, 1960	11	.298

[a]Primary loading.
[b]Secondary loading.

None of these variables correlated meaningfully with the Standards Typology in Table 4. There could be a true pattern connecting these six variables to the Standard Typology but in light of the moderate loadings, the low correlations and the fourth rank of this factor that seems unlikely.

Table 20 indicated a fairly high primary loading for Federal grants to state library programs, a negative moderate loading for 1968 state library appropriations and a low secondary loading for the Standards and Appropriations Typology.

Table 20.--Factor V, Rank and Loadings > .199.

Rank	Variable Name	Var. #	Loading
1	Federal Grant Obligations to State Library Agencies, Per Capita, FY 1967	76	.790[a]
2	State Health and Hospital Expenditures, Per Capita, 1961	47	.618[b]
3	State Health and Hospital Expenditures, Per Capita, Change 1961-67	70	-.608[b]
4	Urban Population, Change 1950-60	54	-.372[b]
5	State Appropriations Per Capita for Direct Library Programs, 1968	74	-.361[b]
6	Standards and Appropriations Typology	79	.221[b]
7	Democratic Percentage of State Lower House, Change 1964-66	59	.204

[a]Primary loadings.
[b]Secondary loadings.

The fifth factor also had the usual health and hospital inversion relationship as well as a negative loading on urban population change and a very low loading on early Democratic strength in the lowest legislative house.

The pattern of the fifth factor reflects the earlier correlations. These relationships have already been discussed and probably appear here because they possess only enough strength to fit into the fifth factor.

The Political Activity Typology has its strongest loading on the sixth variable (Table 21) as does 1968 state library appropriations at a lower loading. The secondary loading for federal library grants

appears here but with a low loading. A fourth library variable, the Standards and Appropriations Typology, has a moderate loading on this variable.

Table 21.--Factor VI, Rank and Loadings > .199.

Rank	Variable Name	Var. #	Loading
1	Political Activity Typology	80	.813[a]
2	State Appropriations Per Capita for Direct Library Programs, 1968	74	.456[a]
3	Democratic Percentage State Upper House, Average 1964-68	13	-.408[b]
4	Population Percentage, Change 1960-68	52	.366[b]
5	Standards and Appropriations Typology	79	.324
6	Unemployment Rate, 1960	11	-.314
7	Federal Grant Obligations to State Library Agencies, FY 1967	76	.243[b]
8	Urban Population, Change, 1950-60	54	.239
9	Public School Expenditures, Per Pupil, ADA, Change 1961-67	71	.212[b]
10	Public School Expenditures, Per Pupil, ADA, 1967-68	28	.210

[a]Primary loadings.
[b]Secondary loadings.

The negative relationship found in the correlations on Democratic upper legislative house strength in recent years reappears. Population and urban population increases appear here with moderate and low relationships respectively. Finally, both public school expenditure measures show a low positive relationship to the sixth variable.

This factor suggest some modifications in the analysis in the earlier discussion concerning the Political Activity Variable. The weak, largely negative, voter participation relationships do not appear here and should not be considered as of much importance to this political activity variable. This is also true of the low relationship in Table 6 on personal income and state welfare spending. On the other hand two low public educational relationships appear here that do not appear there which indicates that their appearance here should not be taken very seriously.

The Standards and Appropriations Typology is the only library measure to appear in the seventh and final factor.

Table 22.--Factor VII, Rank and Loadings $>$ .199.

Rank	Variable Name	Var. #	Loadings
1	Democratic Percentage of State Lower House, Change 1964-66	59	-.805[a]
2	Standards and Appropriations Typology	79	.478[a]
3	Unemployment Rate, 1960	11	.304
4	Urban Population, Change 1950-60	54	.278
5	Democratic Percentage of State Upper House, Average 1964-68	13	.208

[a]Primary loadings.
[b]Secondary loadings.

Table 22 indicates that Democratic weakness in the early lower legislative house measure has the highest loading on the seventh factor, but higher than average Democratic strength in the upper legislative house in more recent measures produces a low positive relationship. There is also a low to moderate relationship on this factor to the 1960 unemployment rate and increasing urban population.

The seventh factor relationships cannot be taken too seriously because of the nature of the statistic at this point and because of the weak loading of the library variable on this factor.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The basic objectives for this study are stated in Chapter One. The results of the data analyses are described in Chapter Three, while remarks on methodology and data collection methods are in Chapter Two. Data used in the study are displayed in the Appendices. This section of the report deals with conclusions derived from the analyses of data, and from the discussions held among the study staff and the Advisory Committee. Finally, recommendations are offered for additional research on the application of these findings.

One major concern was the current status of financial operations. It is apparent that incomplete data collection makes it difficult to offer comprehensive statements about the funding, hence the level of support, of state library agencies. The lack of comparable data from the questionnaire on some items limited the full implementation of the original research design.

The questionnaire attempted to define the organizational structure of state library agencies in an attempt to find out if such structures were significantly related to the financial operations of each agency. Differences in and between state agencies, however, do not allow for a full explanation of the relationship between programs such as state aid, LSCA title funds, etc.; instead, there is an obvious element of control related to the position of the agency within state government which determines the funding pattern. Information about this control is not clearly stated in the responses (perhaps because of the questions asked).

Information was sought on the political activities of the state library staff, on the assumption that such activity would be indicative of the success of the funding of the agency, the effectiveness of the total library program, and the posture of the agency within state government. A number of the respondents felt that these questions were somewhat out of order (a la the Hatch Act concept for federal employees), and none of the questions on personal political activity was used in the analysis. However, the material on library agency efforts to secure political support were utilized and are important to the findings.

The concern of the investigators was to apply a standardized technique for comparing a variety of political-socio-economic background factors with the financial data for state library operations

so as to seek correlations between these two groups of data. It was thought that the state library program, as an activity of state government, might indicate some interplay with educational levels, election participation, party competitiveness, employment, income, demographic, and other common factors of the analysis of policy output--that result of effort which relates to the implementation of a program. The correlations were mostly of a low or moderate significance. The significance of this limited finding is in itself useful: the size of the library venture, in each state and for the country as a whole, is so small compared to other major public expenditures that output measurements do not indicate that environmental conditions place any real limits on the development of library activity.

This finding is a reflection of the specific, limited, yet commonly held role of libraries. It has been assumed that state libraries in their promotion of public library service relate closely to education in terms of function, unique roles and services, and general educational responsibilities. But the data show that the actual amount of expenditures for state library functions is so small compared to the state's educational commitment that the correlation between them is only slightly positive. What does this tell state librarians, and others concerned with the role of the agency and its effectiveness?

The major implication of this finding is that concern for comparative "bigness"--i.e., comparable dollars, staff, resources, etc.--is not the answer. Whatever the actual size (dollar amounts) of allocations or appropriations for library services, the total amount is a fractional portion of state budgets, and within the political framework coupled with other control factors state library agencies do not compete in actual dollar amounts or in percentage terms with large state operations. The alliance with education is more assumed than real, then, since the educational effort follows the general lines of the state and/or national economy; while the library portion, whether supported from the state educational department or as an independent agency, is unrelated to the large economic sweep.

The data analyzed in this report indicate that the 12 state library agencies presently operating within the state departments of education are favorably situated as to financial support. This favorable position may be due to political sponsorship, the nature of states which prefer this structural arrangement, or for other reasons. Additional study is needed of their administrative character, support, political relationships, and so on for comparison with the majority of agencies now either within other departments of government or which operate as separate independent bodies.

The main point, however, regarding the present status of state library agencies <u>vis-a-vis</u> the economic relationship, is that there appears to be a valid direction for the future of these agencies if they combine some portion of their lobbying effort with other low budget

agencies--e.g. health, hospitals, recreation. Such activities appear to possess funding patterns more similar to state library agencies than larger programs funded by state government such as education and roads.

An assumption, or a value judgement, was made by the investigators regarding the significance of state library grants-in-aid programs: that such programs are as important as any other expenditures in measuring state library effort; further, that such programs should be administered by the state library agency. The assumption was based on the idea that adequate state library legislation would commit the state to continuing financial support for the development of public library services. The returns showed that there is still, in 1969, a large gap between the availability of such aid in state legislation as only 34 of the 50 states (68 percent) reported affirmatively on this question.

It is interesting to note from Table 12 that the per capita income variable is evenly divided in both groups, indicative, perhaps, that this variable is not a basic restriction on the establishment of such aid programs. Rather, it appears that the implementation of state aid stems from the convictions of state librarians, a master plan, effective political action, and other background activities.

Other assumptions about the basic ingredients of a successful state library operation were included in the questionnaire: 1) that a master plan is necessary for both total library development and for state public library services to which budget requests are related; 2) the implementation of a set of standards for state agency personnel is important (based on minimum qualifications for each class of employee); 3) relationships with governmental bodies such as legislative committees and legislators are basic; 4) and the extent of relationships between the agency and professional library organizations as well as nonlibrary interest groups is a reflection of adequate agency operation.

The returns from the questionnaire and the correlations support the following conclusions:

1) On the question of master plans, very little difference was found between states with or without such devices so far as environmental data are concerned--i.e., population density, unemployment rate, etc., appeared to have little influence on whether the agency had a master plan.

2) Since all states reported that they implement some standards for the employment of personnel, little variation was found in analysis of the variables. Since a majority of states had civil service systems for both professional and non-professional

personnel, the concept of a firm system of personnel practice is both important and widespread without reference to variables studied.

3) Accepted lobbying procedures by state library agencies resulted in quality programs and higher appropriations. A state library agnecy could secure one or the other of these legislative policy goals with only average political activity, but not both.

4) Data reveal that successful legislative library policy is secured when library professionals work with non-professional groups to influence political decision makers.

These questions, and other related ones, attempted to assess the state agency as a political entity in terms familiar to those who believe that there is a strong correlation (success factor) between the stature of an agency and its awareness of the specifics of political activity. Quite aside from the question of political affiliation--or connections--of the state librarian, there is the practical consideration of the involvement of people outside the agency to further the objectives, programs, and stature of the state library agency. It is assumed, of course, that leadership in the promotion and implementation of state library service programs stems from the agency and its director; further, it should be assumed that the impetus toward legislative advances to further state library services will originate from the agency and be supported by both the professional organizations and citizen groups, political and otherwise. These points speak to the objectives of the study to discover and analyze existing relationships between state library legislation and the state library agency.

Previous studies, such as those by Garceau, Monypenny, and Garrison, attest to the problem presented by the librarian (of the state agency or other level of service) as an apolitical person more concerned with the innards of operation than with the relationships between the library and its total constituency. The returns to this questionnaire, in 1969, do not reflect a great change--or improvement--in this posture of professional librarians as previously described. But the study does indicate that effective political activity by library agencies can have meaningful results for the state library program.

How, then, can we account for the fact that the majority of states has achieved a grants-in-aid program which prescribes the expenditure of general revenue funds for library services? The answer lies in the fact that a variety of people--professional librarians, library authorities, legislators, citizens--have joined forces to gain support for such funding. Environmental variables indicate some interesting disparities in that such aid appears where it might seem least likely to be supported. Whether or not, in such situations, the state agency has been directly involved in the larger political process, some combination of political activities has resulted in the support of quality state library programs.

The typologies, explained and illustrated in the section on quantitative data (Chapters Two and Three) reveal certain interesting aspects of state library agency relationships. These aspects of operation were: budget, innovations such as master plans and level of perceived political involvement. On the basis of questionnaire returns, scales were constructed to produce the typology variables. A number of questions are raised through this methodological device, for which additional research might be needed:

1) Does the operation of school equalization aid programs provide any guidance for state library aid programs? If so, what elements of typical school equalization might be applied to library aid?

2) Are master plans for public library service or for total library development related to demographic changes throughout the state, and are such plans an indication of state government policy or the result of adequate relationships with other agencies?

3) What new library activities, which were requested during the last budget year and the preceding annual period, represent innovative practices, replacement of current services, etc.? What portion of budget requests were made for new directions vs. continuances? What evaluations were made of either class of request?

4) What disposition was made of existing state library agency studies and ensuing recommendations in relation to budgets?

5) What kinds of nonlibrary groups support the library agency in the pursuit of new legislation, new programs, increased financial support, and other agency needs? How successful were such efforts?

6) How effective is the organizational pattern of the state library agency with respect to its limited functions? What functional changes might be necessary within the agency to promote either a master plan or implementation of statewide library services? Is either of these innovations desirable?

7) What assessment is being made on a regular basis of the effectiveness of LSCA monies vs. state funds, for both internal agency programs and for the implementation of statewide services?

8) What legislation is needed to implement accepted national standards for library services, with regard to: a) personnel, b) resources, and c) total budget? Has the acceptance of standards been accompanied by increased budgets, improved services, and innovative programs?

9) What political attitudes and attributes of professional librarians and related public personnel relate to the program and funding levels?

Responses to the questionnaire as illustrated in the tables, with due regard to the status of the different state agencies, indicate that certain aspects of library development or statewide programs are emphasized. Some states ranked high on the typology items which relate to their definitions of political activity--i.e., their responses indicated a high level of awareness of political involvement, in terms of the questions asked about such activity. Some of these states have not been regarded as those having large allocations, substantial state aid, etc., and yet they show up well when quality standards and appropriations are combined. On the other hand, the "model" states whose programs have been the prototypes of increased appropriations, and whose staffs are regarded as efficient and knowledgeable, uniformly do not fare so well in this analysis.

The responses given about appropriations and interpretations made by respondents of the questions on the political activities of state agency directors and the agency within the political process may partly account for these findings. The states with high rank on the Political Activity Typology are those whose answers, if not activities, were such as to elicit a high score; the states in the low category on this typology indicated low levels of political activity.

A basic objective of the study was to analyze current state library legislation in order to ascertain if there were common patterns within these laws affecting finances, organization, services, grants-in-aid programs, etc. The summary provided by Dr. Ladenson of legislation for state aid programs reveals a common orientation for the promotion of statewide services, but no common pattern for aid programs. (See Appendix C.)

There appears to be no evidence, so far as correlations with socio-economic-political data are concerned, that the states have patterned their legislation along common lines which stem from such background characteristics. The large range of legislation is much more alike in basic terms--permissiveness, service responsibilities, fiscal limitations--than in any differences relating to individual state characteristics. There is little legislation which directs the agency toward the position of a central state information service; there is almost no attention in the laws to the concept of the state library agency as the coordinating body for all types of library services; there is no apparent concern, as yet, except in Hawaii, for state library agencies to be structured as the apex of a total public library system or network. Whatever of these responsibilities or directions have emerged is due to agency director leadership, not legislative direction. However, since most of the legislation is permissive in almost all aspects (except for appropriations which are

usually limited), it is probably best that specific roles not be detailed, nor specific lists of additional responsibilities be defined.

The correlation of information about legislation and financial support, another objective for this study, was sought through the manipulation of quantitative data. Such data were presumed to show any influences which might exist related to the formulation and implementation of legislation, in that population, characteristics, political behavior, employment, and per capita income (among many other variables) could be thought to be controls on the kinds of laws affecting state library services. Sufficient comment has been made about the low level of correlation found between these environmental data and legislation. One major conclusion drawn from this evidence is that legislation is created and approved irrespective of such background factors, with the result, country-wide, that library laws are very similar. The same conclusion applied to the absence of any relationship between state environment and public library income.

Librarians, as the professional personnel most likely to be affected by such legislation, have been the group most closely allied to the formulation of library laws. But for the years ahead, it appears that other governmental concerns, stated by other officers of state government, must be reconciled with library growth for more effective and relevant legislation. Current efforts regarding state executive reorganization, legislation, professionalism, and planned program budgeting all point in this direction. The concept of systems and networks of statewide dimension, the amalgamation of different types of libraries for superior service at lower costs, the continuing scarcity of professional personnel, and the low percentage of state budgets (even with more dollars in hand) allocated to library services--all these important factors, plus others, must be correlated through attention to another kind of environmental control: the short term and long term operation of state government. Future legislation will be neither advantageous nor expansive for library development unless it results from a cross-agency, or multiple purpose, orientation for library services to be supported by state revenues.

A number of recommendations, derived from the questions raised earlier and from the results of the study, can be stated:

1) A continuing study should be made of agency appropriation patterns to determine the demands for internal functions for library service to state government in comparison with the growth of information and research functions within government, in relation to the amounts spent for public library development.

2) Continuing review should be made of the grants-in-aid program as to its relation to local (appropriations) for local services; legislation may be needed to either correct inequities or to provide a better sharing of responsibilities. Special reference to metropolitan areas and low income minority groups should be made in this effort. Federal funding formulas should be examined for fairness and for impact upon library program innovation.

3) The role of the state librarian in the state political process within legal constraints, should be analyzed continuously as the state library agency proceeds to develop its statewide commitment. What should be the future role of the director in statewide library development, and what responsibilities for him should be legalized?

4) The relation between professional library organizations and other bodies which stand to gain from improved library services of all types should be studied, in terms of potential legislative needs--interstate compacts, library network establishment, etc.

5) The size, quality, and conditions of employment of professional librarians in the state library agency, and as coworkers in the profession throughout the state, should be evaluated continuously and, if necessary, legislation should be sought to standardize personnel practices.

6) There is a continuing and desperate need for a central statistical clearing-house to provide uniform up-to-date, and complete data on the questions within this study as well as to supply data on other library operations.

7) Library associations should sponsor workshops and develop manuals to provide guidance on the building of political support for quality library programs.

APPENDIX A

Quantitative Variables

Variable No.	
1	Civilian Resident Population, 1968
2	Population Density, 1960
3	Population Density, 1968
4	Percent Change of Percentage of Urban Population, 1950 to 1960
5	Unemployment Rate, 1960
6	Unemployment Rate, 1967
7	Percentage Engaged in Manufacturing, 1960
8	Percentage Engaged in Manufacturing, 1967
9	Personal Income Per Capita, 1960
10	Personal Income Per Capita, 1967
11	Democratic Percentage of State Upper House, 1964
12	Democratic Percentage of State Upper House, 1966
13	Democratic Percentage of State Upper House, Average, 1964-68
14	Democratic Percentage of State Lower House, 1964
15	Democratic Percentage of State Lower House, 1966
16	Democratic Percentage of State Lower House, Average 1964-68
17	Registered Participation Percentage in Gubernatorial Elections, Average 1962-68
18	General Revenue, Total, 1967
19	General Revenue from Federal Government, 1967
20	General Revenue from Taxes, 1967
21	General Revenue from Property Taxes, 1967
22	General Expenditure: Total, 1967
23	General Expenditure: Education, Total, 1967
24	State Payments to Local Governments, Per Capita Increase, 1957-67
25	Total State General Revenue, Per Capita, 1967
26	State Hospitals Expenditure, Per Capita, 1967
27	State Health Expenditures, Per Capita, 1967
28	Public School Expenditures, Per Pupil, ADA, 1967-68
29	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Congressional Elections, 1966
30	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Congressional Elections, 1962
31	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Congressional Elections, 1958
32	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Presidential Election, 1968
33	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Presidential Election, 1964

Variable No.	
34	State and Local Public Welfare Expenditures, Per Capita, 1967
35	State Population Percentage Electing Majority of Legislature, Dauer and Kelsay Computation, 1955
36	Vote Value in States Largest County, 1960, David and Eisenberg Conputation
37	State and Local Educational Expenditure, Per Capita, 1961
38	State and Local Public Welfare Expenditure, Per Capita, 1961
39	Total State and Local Revenues, Per Capita, 1961
40	Total State and Local Tax Revenues, Per Capita, 1961
41	State Revenues, Per Capita, 1961
42	Public School Expenditures, Per Pupil, APA, 1961-62
43	State and Local Educational Expenditure as Percent of Total, 1961
44	State Lower House Majority Party Percentage, 1954-69
45	State Upper House Majority Party Percentage, 1954-62
46	Eligible Voter Participation Percentage in Gubernatorial Elections, 1954-62
47	State Health and Hospitals Expenditure, Per Capita, 1961
48	Total State and Local Tax Revenue, Per Capita, 1961
49	Total State and Local Federal Revenue, Per Capita, 1961
50	Property Taxes as Percent of Total State-Local Tax Revenue, 1961
51	Population Percentage, Change 1960-68
52	Population Percentage, Change 1960-68
53	Population Density, Change 1960-68
54	Percentage Urban Population, Change 1950-60
55	Persons Unemployment, Change 1960-67
56	Persons Engaged in Manufacturing, Change 1960-67
57	Personal Income, Per Capita, Change 1960-67
58	Democratic Percentage of State Upper House, Change 1964-66
59	Democratic Percentage of State Lower House, Change 1964-66
60	Percent Total Resident Population of Voting Age Casting Votes in Congressional Elections, Change 1964-68
61	Percent Total Resident Population of Voting Age Casting Votes for President, Change 1964-68
62	Registered Voter Participation Percentage in Gubernatorial Elections, 1962-68
63	General Revenue, (State-Local), Change, 1961-67
64	State and Local Revenue from Federal Government, Change 1961-67
65	State and Local General Revenue from Taxes, Change 1961-67
66	State and Local General Revenue from Property Taxes 1961-67

Variable No.	
67	Total State and Local General Expenditures, Change 1961-67
68	State and Local General Expenditures, Total Education, Change 1961-67
69	State General Revenue Total, Change, 1961-67
70	Health and Hospital Expenditures, Change 1961-67
71	Public School Expenditure, Per Pupil, ADA, Change 1961-67
72	State Welfare Expenditures, Change 1961-67
73	Public Library Expenditures, Per Capita, FY 1956
74	State Library Expenditures, Per Capita, 1968
75	State Library Expenditures, Per Capita, 1956
76	Federal Grant Obligations to State Library Agencies, FY 1967
77	Public Library Income (Excluding Federal Funds), FY 1967
78	State Library Agency Standards Typology
79	State Library and Appropriations Standards Typology
80	Political Activity Typology
81	Public Library Expenditures, Change 1956-67
82	State Library Expenditures, Change 1956-68

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire for State Library Agency with Response Frequencies (N's are given in parenthesis)

Item No.

1 State (50) 100%

2 Year statehood granted (39) 78%

3 Year State Library Agency established (38) 76%

4 If Agency has governing board or commission please indicate below the method through which members are selected:

1. Appointment by Governor (34) 68%
2. Appointment by other official (specify) (2) 4%
3. Ex. officio members (indicate positions) (12) 24%
4. Election (3) 6%
5. Not applicable (5) 10%

5 For the following activities of the state library agency, indicate for each (1) whether practice is prescribed by law

Activity	Responsibility Vested in			
	1. State Librarian	2. Governing Board	3. Other State Official (specify)	4. Other (specify)
a. Establish broad policy	(12) 24%	(37) 74%	(4) 8%	
b. Establish rules and regulations	(26) 52%	(28) 56%	(6) 12%	(1) 2%
c. Select staff members	(45) 90%	(8) 16%	(15) 30%	(2) 4%
d. Maintain legislative ties and seek fiscal support	(38) 76%	(29) 58%	(18) 36%	(3) 6%
e. Employ state librarian		(38) 76%	(11) 22%	(2) 4%

Item No.

5 or formal regulation or has developed informally through practice; and for each (2) indicate person or group by whom function is performed by entering an "L" (law) or a "P" (practice) under the appropriate column heading. For some activities authority may be exercised by more than one person or group.

6 If Agency has Advisory Board, please indicate below the method of selecting members:

1. Appointment by Governor (13) 26%
2. Appointment by other, specify (13) 26%
3. Ex-officio members (indicate positions) (6) 12%
4. Election
5. Not applicable (24) 48%

7 Year present physical agency quarters constructed or remodeled (44) 88%

8 Do you consider the quarters you are occupying:

1. Most adequate (room for expansion) (3) 6%
2. Adequate for present needs (9) 18%
3. Inadequate (crowded) (12) 24%
4. Very inadequate (efficiency impaired) (26) 52%

9 If not adequate has improvement been sought?

1. Yes (36) 72%
2. No (2) 4%

10 If answer yes, when? (33) 66%

11 What was the result? (33) 66%

FUNCTIONS

12 All of the following functions are carried on by some of the State Library Agencies. For each, applicable to your Agency, please indicate level of participation by estimating the effort (personnel) committed to that particular function. EXCLUDE costs of building construction, renovation or maintenance from total effort or from functional effort.

	FUNCTION	PERCENT OF TOTAL EFFORT
		(46) 92%
A.	Library Development, Extension, and Service Consultant and planning, promotion, reference and lending (43) 86%	
	Grants-in-aid to local public libraries	(34) 68%
B.	Genealogy and History	(20) 40%
C.	Archives and Record Management	(9) 18%
D.	Legislative Reference	(19) 38%
E.	Law	(13) 26%
F.	Federal Document Depository	(24) 48%
G.	State Document Depository	(28) 56%
H.	Services for other state agencies and/or institutional services	(32) 64%
I.	Grants-in-aid to non-public local libraries	
J.	Other, specify:	(9) 18%
		(2) 4%
		(1) 2%
		(1) 2%
	Total Effort (excluding commitment for buildings)	100%

Item No.		Fiscal Year Ending In:					
13	LEVEL OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT	1968	1967	1966	1965	1964	1956
	Apprn. for Direct Library Expenditures:						
	Initial Agency Budget Request[1]	(42)84%	(38)76%	(36)72%	(37)74%	(34)68%	(28)56%
	Granted by Legislature	(48)96%	(47)94%	(47)94%	(47)94%	(46)92%	(41)32%
	Of the Above Total Appropriation:						
	Requested for Library Development, extension and service	(30)60%	(27)54%	(26)52%	(26)52%	(24)48%	(20)40%
	Appropriated for same	(31)62%	(30)60%	(28)56%	(28)56%	(28)56%	(25)50%
	State Funds Requested for Matching Federal (LSCA) Funds[2]						
	Title I	(24)48%	(24)48%	(23)46%	(23)46%	(21)42%	(14)28%
	Title II	(8)16%	(2) 4%	(3) 6%	(4) 8%	XXXXX	XXXXX
	Granted for matching Federal (LSCA) Funds:						
	Title I	(23)46%	(21)42%	(22)44%	(22)44%	(20)40%	(4) 8%
	Title II	(6)12%	(4) 8%	(5)10%	(5)10%	XXXXX	XXXXX
	Federal Grants Received (LSCA):						
	Title I	(43)86%	(42)84%	(41)82%	(40)80%	(38)76%	(12)24%
	Title II	(43)86%	(42)84%	(39)78%	(36)72%	XXXXX	XXXXX
	Title III	(40)80%	(38)78%	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX
	Title IV A	(40)80%	(38)78%	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX
	Title IV B	(40)80%	(38)78%	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX
	Other Revenue Received:						
	Grants and Gifts	(7)14%	(7)14%	(5)10%	(4) 8%	(4) 8%	(2) 4%
	Contract Income (indirect matching)	(2) 4%	(1) 2%	(1) 2%	(1) 2%	(1) 2%	
	Other, Specify	(2) 4%	(3) 6%	(3) 6%	(3) 6%	(2) 4%	(2) 4%

[1]Original Agency request regardless of level to which request is directed.

[2]Omit local revenues used for matching purposes.

STATE FUNDS FOR LOCAL PUBLIC LIBRARIES AND SYSTEMS

Item No.

14 Does your State have a program of grants-in-aid from state funds for local public libraries or systems?

1. Yes (34) 68%
2. No (16) 32%

15 If yes, what year was this program instituted? (29) 58%

16 Expenditures for State grant-in-aid program:

1968	1967	1966	1965	1964	1956
(29)58%	(27)54%	(27)54%	(26)52%	(25)50%	(26)52%

17 Is this program administered through the State Library Agency?

1. Yes (33) 66%
2. No _____

18 If not, what state agency has this responsibility?
(3) 6%

19 What methods does your state use in allocating grants-in-aid?

a. Equalization	1. Yes	(3) 6%	No	(3) 6%
b. Establishment	1. Yes	(14)28%	No	(3) 6%
c. Per Capita	1. Yes	(22)44%	No	_____
d. Area	1. Yes	(12)24%	No	(3) 6%

e. Specify other special purpose grants: _____

20 Please explain any variation from your state's statute in distributing funds, and include a copy of your formula used for distributing funds: (20) 40%

STATE FUNDS FOR NON-PUBLIC LIBRARIES

21 Does your State have a program of grants-in-aid for non-public local library service?

1. Yes (1) 2%
2. No (49) 48%

22 If yes, what year was this program instituted? (1) 2%

23 Expenditures for non-public library service grants-in-aid:
1968 (1) 2% 1967 _____ 1966 _____ 1965 _____
1964 _____ 1956 _____

BUDGET PROCESS

24 Does your State have a master plan for total library development?

1. Yes (24) 48%
2. No (21) 42%
3. Being developed (5) 10%

Item No.

25 If yes, what group or person developed the plan? (26) 52%

26 Does your state have a master plan for state public library services?
1. Yes (37) 74%
2. No (13) 26%

27 If yes, what group or person developed the plan? (31) 62%

28 What period (years) does it cover? (31) 62%

29 Are your initial budget requests related to the master plan?
1. Yes (35) 70%
2. No (5) 10%

30 When requests are not granted in total, are determinations for limiting or omitting specific activities made by:
1. The State Librarian (34) 68%
2. Governing Board (21) 42%
3. Other State Official (9) 18%
4. Legislature (12) 24%
5. Other (2) 4%

31 Were requests for new library activities included in either your 1967 or 1968 budget?
1. Yes (32) 64%
2. No (16) 32%

32 If yes, please complete the following:

	Initial Budget Request		Legislative Budget Request		Legislative Appropriations	
	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968
New Activities	(15)30%	(19)38%	(8)16%	(13)26%	(7)14%	(12)24%
% of total budget	(11)22%	(13)26%	(5)10%	(10)20%	(5)10%	(10)20%

33 What person or group has major responsibility for development of the library budget? (46) 92%

34 What person or group has authority for final approval before submission to the legislature or legislative body? (50) 100%

35 In the past four years have any library professional organizations in your state been active in lending support for your initial budget requests?*
1. Yes (36) 72%
2. No (15) 30%

36 If not, has such help been requested?
1. Yes (5) 10%
2. No (10) 20%

37 If yes, what has been the nature of their activity and what influence do you think this has had on the final appropriation for your agency? (21) 42%

---

*Percentage totals to more than 100% as some respondents replied both yes and no.

Item No.

38 In the past four years has any organized interest group (such as League of Women Voters) actively worked for support for your library program?
   1. Yes (25) 50%
   2. No (25) 50%

39 If yes, please identify the group(s). (20) 40%

40 If yes, what was the nature of their activity? (23) 46%

41 What influence do you think this has had on the final appropriation for your agency? (21) 42%

42 What was the action of your state at the time participation in the Federal Library Services Act was offered:
   1. Accepted (44) 88%
   2. Refused (6) 12%

43 If the initial offer were refused, what factor(s) do you perceive as leading to eventual acceptance of the program provisions under the Federal Library Services Act. (1) 2%

44 Are any state revenues earmarked for the state library agency operation, including grant-in-aid programs?
   1. Yes (9) 18%
   2. No (41) 82%

45 If yes, please give the source and comment on use of these earmarked revenues. (8) 16%

PERSONNEL

STATE LIBRARIAN OR HEAD OF STATE LIBRARY AGENCY

46 Length of service in this position (50) 100%

47 When a different political party (or administration in one-party states) takes over the state government, is there a turnover in this position?
   1. Always
   2. Sometimes (4) 8%
   3. Never (46) 92%

48 Position held immediately prior to this appointment (49) 98%

49 State in which prior position located (47) 94%

50 Membership in political party:
   1. Democratic (19) 38%
   2. Republican (12) 24%
   3. Other (2) 4%
   4. None (11) 22%

51 Would you characterize your political activity at either the national, state or local government level as:
   1. Very active (2) 4%
   2. Active (3) 6%
   3. Somewhat active (15) 30%
   4. Inactive (27) 54%

Item No.

52 Please list any political offices held by you, appointive or elective, for any level of government. Include party committee or precinct duties.

Position	Year
(7) 14%	(4) 8%
(3) 6%	(2) 4%

53 Has the State Librarian or one of the top four professional staff members held office in any library organization in the past four years?

1. Yes (31) 62%
2. No (4) 8%

54 If yes, please give the number of such offices held by each employee. It is not necessary to identify person or the office held.

Professional Staff	Offices held in: National Organization	Offices held in: State Organization
(32) 64%	(23) 46%	(30) 60%
(22) 44%	(12) 24%	(16) 32%
(11) 22%	(8) 16%	(12) 24%

STANDARDS FOR LIBRARY PERSONNEL

55 The minimum educational qualification for professional employees is:

1. Completion of accredi ed library school (35) 70%
2. Library degree, or an experience equivalency (18) 36%
3. Four-year college degree (4) 8%
4. Other (specify) (2) 4%

56 The minimum educational qualification for sub-professional employees is:

1. Library degree, or an experience equivalency (3) 6%
2. Four-year college degree (28) 56%
3. Other (specify) (15) 30%
4. N.A. (4) 8%

57 If qualifications exist are these established by:

1. Statutory Law (6) 12%
2. Library governing board or body (12) 24%
3. State Librarian (11) 22%
4. State Personnel Agency (26) 52%
5. Other (specify) (8) 16%

Item No.

58 Are the professional personnel in the State Library covered by a state civil service system?
1. Yes (26) 52%
2. No (19) 38%

59 Are clerical staff members in the State Library covered by a classified civil service system?*
1. Yes (35) 70%
2. No (16) 32%

60 Is there a turnover in these clerical positions with a change in the state administrators?
1. Always
2. Sometimes (2) 4%
3. Never (48) 96%

61 Number of budgeted professional positions for State Library:

Total Positions	12/31/68	12/31/64
Library Development, Extension and Service	(46)92%	(43)86%
Other Functions	(35)70%	(34)68%

POLICY OBJECTIVES

62 What do you consider the most important function of your library agency? (48) 96%

63 Which of the following do you perceive as the most influential in developing a state-wide program of library service?
1. The State Library Association (24) 48%
2. The State Librarian or Head of State Library Agency (33) 66%
3. The State Library Governing Board (10) 20%
4. The National Library Association (2) 40%
5. Other (specify) (13) 26%

64 In your perception of library support, could you identify a person or a group within the state whom you consider the most influential in obtaining legislative approval for your programs? (This could be a member of the legislature, the governor, a private citizen, or group).
1. Yes (32) 64%
2. No (14) 28%

65 If yes, please identify by position of individual or by name of group. (37) 74%

---

*Percentage totals to more than 100% as one respondent replied yes and no.

Item No.

66 In the past two years have you, or another representative of your library agency, appeared before any legislative committee relative to the state library program, or relative to library operations within the state?
1. Yes (48) 96%
2. No (1) 2%

67 If yes, identify the position of representative and explain briefly his activity. (47) 94%

68 Do you or another representative of your agency informally contact legislators to explain your library needs or seek support for library legislation?
1. Yes (45) 90%
2. No (5) 10%

69 If yes, how frequently?
1. Very frequently (3) 6%
2. Frequently (19) 38%
3. Infrequently (14) 28%
4. Never

70 Would you characterize the nature of these contacts as:
1. Formal (8) 16%
2. Informal (40) 80%

71 Would you assess the value of these contacts in assisting you obtain your library objectives:
1. Very valuable (24) 48%
2. Helpful (21) 42%
3. Of no value
4. Other, comment

72 If contact has not been made or requested with a legislative committee or member, why not? (3) 6%

For each of the following programs, please evaluate its effect on the success of your library legislative program.

73 Evaluation or research studies on state library services:
1. Very effective (11) 22%
2. Some effect (31) 62%
3. No effect (2) 4%
4. Not applicable (6) 12%

74 Demonstration or experimental library service programs:
1. Very effective (27) 54%
2. Some effect (17) 34%
3. No effect (2) 4%
4. Not applicable (2) 4%

75 Governor's conference on legislation:
1. Very effective (5) 10%
2. Some effect (7) 14%
3. No effect (1) 2%
4. Not applicable (27) 54%

APPENDIX C

THE ROLE OF STATE GOVERNMENT IN THE ESTABLISHMENT, PROMOTION AND SUPPORT OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES

ALEX LADENSON

APPENDIX C

The Role of State Government in the Establishment, Promotion and Support of Public Libraries

Historical Background:

I

State libraries came into existence early in the 19th century. Between 1816 and 1819, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, New Hampshire and New York established libraries primarily for the use of the legislature. Nevertheless the act creating the State library of New York declared that its object was to found "a public library for the use of the government and of the people of the State." By 1840 there were twenty-two state libraries organized, and by 1876 every state and territory in the Union had a library located at its capital whose collections were predominantly in the realm of law. Some of the state libraries, however, such as that of New York, California, Illinois, Virginia and Massachusetts housed sizable collections in the field of history, biography and political economy, and these were used extensively by the general public. This trend continued to flourish through the years with the result that a number of state libraries today have strong collections in various fields of knowledge. They do not serve state government officials exclusively, but in a general way operate as public libraries for the state at large.

II

In considering the relationship of state government to public libraries, it is germane to observe that it was the state that provided the legal framework for the establishment of public libraries. In our political system local government is a subdivision of state government. Cities and other municipal corporations such as towns, villages, boroughs as well as counties and townships are creatures of the state. They are created by the state and they can be dissolved by the state, subject of course to such constitutional limitations that may exist. Whatever legal power municipalities enjoy is derived from the state. From this it follows that in order for a city to provide public library service on a tax-supported basis, it is essential that it first obtain the necessary legislative authority from the state to engage in such activities. Thus, when the city of Boston decided in 1848 to establish a tax-supported public library, it was obliged to petition the state legislature for the necessary authorization to do this. In 1849, New Hampshire was the first state to enact a general library law empowering towns and cities to create tax-supported

public libraries. In 1872, Illinois adopted a free public library act which served as a model for many states. Today in each of the fifty states there is a substantial body of statutory law that provides the legal machinery for the establishment, financial support and governmental management of public libraries. The strength and growth of public libraries is to a large degree dependent on the taxing power that is granted to the municipality by the state for this purpose.

III

In 1890, a third major movement occurred which affected the state's role in public library development. On May 28, 1890, the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts adopted an act to promote the establishment and efficiency of free public libraries. Thus the Bay state was not only the first to inaugurate tax-supported public library service by authorizing the establishment of the Boston Public Library, but it was also the first to organize a state agency for the extension and promotion of public libraries through the creation of a State Board of Library Commissioners. The duties of this Board were to render assistance to public libraries seeking advice on operational and administrative problems. The Board was also empowered to make an establishment grant of $100 for books to any town without a free public library providing it was matched with a fixed minimum amount of local funds. This Massachusetts act of 1890 marked the beginning of what came to be known as the free library commission movement. The following year, New Hampshire established a library commission. New York was the third state to join the movement adopting in 1892 a comprehensive library law in which the State Library was made a central bureau for promoting, stimulating, aiding and directing local libraries. In 1895, the idea was taken up vigorously by Wisconsin and transmitted to many of the western states. By 1909, thirty-four states had created state library commissions or boards. Today every state in the Union has a state library extension agency whose responsibility it is to plan a state program of public library development, conduct basic research on library problems, render consultative services, distribute state aid and assume a leadership role in making provision for adequate library service on a statewide basis.

IV

The fourth and most recent phase of state government participation in the promotion of public library service occurred as a result of the introduction of state aid programs. Although the origin of state aid for public libraries can be traced back to a New York act of 1838, it was not until a century later that this idea took firm root. Ohio in 1935 and Michigan in 1937 were successful in enacting

state aid laws providing for the distribution of a sizable amount of state funds to public libraries. In the South a number of states adopted similar legislation at about the same time. The economic depression of the '30's, that had engulfed the nation, forced local governmental units to look to the state for financial assistance. The most ambitious state aid program came several decades later, however, in 1958 in New York through the introduction of an act promoting the establishment of cooperative library systems that were supported in part by an annual state aid appropriation of approximately $10,000,000. Other states such as California, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island have adopted major state aid programs for public libraries. In some jurisdictions federal funds under the Library Services and Construction Act are utilized to supplement state monies.

The Administrative Structure of State Library Extension Agencies:

The administrative structure of state library extension agencies may be summarized as follows:

In thirty states, the administrative responsibility for public library extension is vested in a board, commission or committee, the members of which are for the most part appointed by the governor. There is considerable diversity in the functioning of these administrative bodies, but essentially they are endowed with the power and duties to promote public library development. Operationally they act through the appointment of a state librarian or an officer who holds a similar title.

In fifteen states, the responsibility to extend public library service is lodged in the state department of education through the creation of a library extension agency. Here, too, there is considerable diversity of administrative practice. In most cases, however, the head of the extension agency is under the direction of the department of education. There are notable exceptions as in the case of California where the state librarian is appointed and serves at the pleasure of the governor. But even in this instance the legal power to determine policy rests with the state board of education.

In four states, Kentucky, Maine, Nevada and Rhode Island, the library extension agency is directly under the office of the governor. In Illinois, public library extension is under the secretary of state who also holds the title of state librarian.

Whether the form of administrative structure of a library extension agency has a determining influence on the extent and quality of public library service has not been ascertained. Nevertheless, one cannot fail to note that some of the most productive agencies are those that operate within the governmental framework of the state department of education.

State Aid Legislation:

State aid is one of the key elements today in providing for the improvement of public library service. The rationale for state aid is based on the principle that education is a primary function of state government, and since public libraries are part of the educational system, it follows that the state has a direct responsibility for their financial support. The recently published state library standards contain the following statement:

> "The state share in financing of local public library service should be at least one-third to one-half of the total cost of a sound minimum public library program as set forth in the state plan for library development."

The state is the logical division of government that can insure adequate library facilities for the people residing within its borders. To begin with it is the state that has the responsibility for the education of all of its citizens. It is the state that has the power to establish and raise standards of service. It is the state that can equalize differences in the economic resources between the various sections within its jurisdiction. Finally it is the state that can invoke and bring to bear a wide range of sources of tax revenue.

- - - - - -

The state of New York has been a pioneer in the field of state aid for public libraries. In 1958 the legislature adopted an act providing for the establishment of a network of cooperative library systems aiming to cover the entire state. In support of this new concept of library service, the state has continued to make annual appropriations of over $10,000,000 for this purpose. The current appropriation is approximately $13,300,000.

The major provisions of the New York law may be summarized as follows:

(1) The organization of a cooperative library system is based on a plan submitted by a group of local libraries which must be approved by the state library. The plan must indicate that it will result in improved and expanded library service to the area. The area of service must contain either 200,000 persons or 4,000 square miles.

(2) The library system is governed by a board of trustees which consists of not less than five nor more than twenty-five persons all of whom serve on the boards of trustees of the local libraries that are members of

the system. The system board enjoys the same powers as the board of any existing library under the New York law. It is a separate legal entity superimposed over the many independent libraries organizing them into a larger unit for the purpose of extending and improving library service over a wide area.

(3) The plan of service must provide for reciprocal borrowing privileges which is honored by every member library within the system.

(4) The state library is empowered to issue regulations fixing standards of service with which a library system must comply. The regulations may relate to: a) book stock; b) maintenance of catalogs; c) number and location of libraries; d) hours of operation; e) qualifications of personnel necessary to enable a library system to render adequate service.

(5) The state library agency may revoke approval of the plan of library service if it finds that the system does not conform to the regulations.

(6) Participating libraries in the system are not permitted to reduce their existing tax rates for library service without penalizing the amount of state aid to be received by the system.

(7) State aid is apportioned to each system on the following basis: (a) An annual grant of from $5,000 to $20,000 depending on the number of counties served; (b) A per capita grant of forty cents based on the population of the service area; (c) An area grant of from $8.00 to $24.00 per square mile depending on the number of counties served.

(8) In addition to the above basic formula, additional amounts are granted for books, periodicals and binding to those systems that qualify for them. An additional five cents per capita is also granted to those systems whose plan for the further development of its central library is approved.

New York state also embarked on a new program in 1966 commonly referred to as the 3 R's: Reference and Research Library Resources, supported by an initial legislative appropriation of $700,000. The purpose of this program is to provide improved access to advanced reference and research library materials to such serious library users as college and university faculty, undergraduate and graduate students, industrial and scientific research personnel, writers, doctors, scholars and other professional persons.

The state library administers this program in accordance with regulations issued by the state commissioner of education. In brief the regulations prescribe the method of organizing a 3-R system by defining its membership, prescribing its area of service and providing a governing board of trustees. Seven Reference and Research agencies have been chartered by the state library.

California, Illinois and Michigan have state aid laws modeled after the New York plan, and make provision for some or all of the following basic elements:

(1) Existing local libraries are permitted to organize themselves into systems by submitting a plan for the improvement of library service to the state library agency for approval.

(2) If the plan is approved, the state makes grants available to the system based primarily on population and square mile area.

(3) The system which is a distinct legal entity is governed by a separate board made up of representatives from the participating libraries.

(4) The residents of the system have full access to the book collections and services of all of the participating libraries.

(5) The library with the strongest resources is generally designated the headquarters library.

(6) Existing local tax levies for public library service may not be reduced beyond a certain prescribed level.

(7) A participating library is permitted to withdraw from the system.

California and Michigan have not fully implemented their programs because of lack of state funds. Illinois enjoys full implementation and appropriates approximately $5,000,000 annually to finance its program.

Pennsylvania has been experimenting with another type of state aid program. The Pennsylvania approach adopted in 1961 differs from that of New York, but in its broad overall objectives is the same. It is essentially a scheme to assist all local libraries meeting standards prescribed in the law. Nevertheless, it does contain certain features of the system concept.

Under the statute, the state librarian is authorized to designate thirty libraries throughout the state as District Library Centers, which may include any public library, state college library, Pennsylvania State University Library or any private college or university library that agrees to serve in that capacity. These Centers are empowered to contract with any public library which wishes to become a part of the District Library Center. The Centers are permitted to provide direct library service to persons residing within the district, to provide supplemental services to all local libraries within the district and to exchange services with other Centers.

The formula for state aid is somewhat involved, based on a graduated scale which is designed to encourage local libraries to increase their tax rate to an amount which will ultimately produce $2.00 per capita. In addition, District Library Centers are allowed twenty-five cents per capita for each person residing in the district but outside the municipality in which such library is located.

The state librarian is also authorized to designate four Regional Library Resource Centers to be located at the Free Library of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania State Library, Pennsylvania State University Library and the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. Regional Centers have the responsibility to acquire major research collections and to make them available to the residents of the state. A board consisting of the head librarians of these four institutions prescribe the rules and regulations under which the Regional Centers must operate. As compensation for services rendered the Regional Centers are granted the sum of $100,000 by the state each year.

The rules and regulations promulgated for both the District Centers as well as the Regional Centers clearly indicate that the purpose of state aid is to promote the system concept of library organization. In approving plans for the use of state funds, the state librarian, under the rules, must determine whether provision has been made for the following items: a) Development of resources; b) Direct reference and information service; c) Interlibrary reference and information service; d) Interlibrary loan of materials; e) Book selection; f) Meetings of librarians and trustees; g) Informing the public.

Approximately $4,500,000 is appropriated annually by Pennsylvania in state aid for public libraries.

The Rhode Island state aid program for public libraries is similar to the Pennsylvania scheme. The law authorizes the department of state library services to establish five interrelated library systems. Within each system the department is required to designate a library to serve as a regional library

center which is to provide supplemental services to the public libraries within the system. For the services rendered, the regional center is awarded a grant-in-aid of not less than twenty-five cents per capita of the population served by it. The law also designates the Providence Public Library as the principal public library of the state, making the collections and services of that library available to the state at large including the regional centers. As compensation for this service, the Providence Public Library is awarded an annual grant of not less than $100,000.

The department of state library services is also authorized to designate a library within each system as a supplementary resource to coordinate school, public academic and special library resources in order to provide improved services to students. Each supplementary resource center is awarded a minimum grant of $10,000 annually.

The state of Rhode Island provides state aid for the construction and capital improvement of any free public library. Grants-in-aid are made for this purpose only if the municipality appropriates an amount equal to or more than the state contribution. Such grants-in-aid may be paid in installments over a period of years up to a maximum of twenty years.

Rhode Island appropriates in toto over $750,000 in state aid for public libraries, representing about thirty percent of the total expenditures for public library service.

Massachusetts, like Rhode Island, has enacted a law establishing a statewide program of regional public library service. The act provides for the creation of not more than five regional public library systems throughout the state to be financed by an annual state appropriation of twenty-five cents for every resident in each regional area. In addition, the state board of library commissioners is authorized to contract with such libraries as it may determine to furnish library service to communities under 25,000 persons, the cost of which shall not exceed fifty cents per person. The law also empowers the board to designate such libraries as it may determine to serve as regional reference and research centers, at a cost not to exceed twenty-five cents for each resident of the regional area.

The total amount of state aid for public libraries in Massachusetts is approximately $1,500,000.

New Jersey adopted a revised state aid program in 1967 which in essence follows the Pennsylvania plan. It introduces a new feature described as "emergency aid." The sum of $200,000 is appropriated annually to be distributed by the state library agency to meet unforeseeable conditions in any municipality or county. It is also designed to encourage the formation and development of larger units of service pursuant to law.

The total amount of state aid for public libraries appropriated by New Jersey is approximately $3,000,000 or about twelve percent of the total amount expended for public library service.

Maryland was one of the early states to adopt an act which provides for a local-state cooperative program for the support and growth of public libraries. The state aid formula is based on a minimum expenditure of $1.20 per capita. Of the entire cost of the minimum cooperative program, the state is obliged to appropriate between twenty and thirty percent depending on the per capita wealth of the county. The county must appropriate the balance which is no less than seventy percent and no more than eighty percent. Failure on the part of the county to appropriate the amount prescribed by law results in the withholding of state funds.

In 1964 Maryland enacted a law creating a Public Library Incentive Fund. Under this act the state makes grants to counties and the city of Baltimore to finance debt service for the purchase of land and the construction of library buildings including equipment and furniture. The state guarantees each county and the city of Baltimore the difference between twenty-five cents per capita and the amount realized from a local tax of one-half cent for the above purpose.

The total amount of state aid for public libraries in Maryland is approximately $1,750,000 annually which is about fifteen percent of the total amount spent for public library service.*

The legal basis for the state aid program in Georgia is a broad grant of power by the legislature to the State Board of Education. The law provides that public library funds shall be apportioned to county and regional public libraries in proportion to the area and population to be served in accordance with regulations and minimum public library requirements prescribed by the State Board. Provision is also made for an amount not less than sixteen cents per person to be distributed to county and regional public libraries for books and other materials.

---

*Editor's note: The following data were sent by Miss Nettie Taylor, Director, Library Extension Division, Maryland State Department of Education:

> The state aid formulae is based on a minimum income of $1,80 per capita, "of the entire cost of the mimimum program the overall state share is 30 percent;" however state support for an individual county ranges from a 20 percent minimum to an 80 percent maximum depending on the per capita wealth of the county. The county must appropriate the balance in order to qualify for state funds. Annual population data from the State Department of Health is used in calculating each county's population.

Total amount of state aid for public libraries appropriated annually by the state of Georgia is approximately $1,500,000 which is equivalent to more than twenty-five percent of the total amount spent for public library service.

An example of a state aid program that has been erected on a scanty legal foundation is that of Tennessee. Section 10-106 of the act establishing the State Library and Archives Commission consists of the following provision:

> The Commission shall develop a state library program calculated to meet the needs of the state and the requirements of its citizens for such services. It shall prepare and submit a budget consistent with its program and shall operate the state library system within the financial resources available.

Despite the brevity of this provision, the state library agency has been successful in developing a network of regional library centers. Each center is administered by a regional library board composed of two representatives from each county in the region. This board receives and expends state funds and is responsible for determining the type of program and activities to be carried on by the center, under terms of a contract with the state library.

In recent years Kansas, Indiana, Oklahoma and Ohio have enacted comprehensive laws providing legal machinery for promoting statewide extension of public library services. Although the statutory framework in all of these instances is elaborate, what is critically lacking is a financial commitment of the state. Without substantial state aid appropriations, these laws are ineffectual.

An inventory of state aid legislation for the extension of public library service reveals that thirty-five states* provide funds for this purpose. There is a wide diversity, however, in the laws governing the distribution of such funds. Nevertheless, there are several broad patterns that have evolved which are common to groups of states.

The plan that has received the widest attention is that of New York. State aid in the Empire state is provided primarily for the development of cooperative library systems that are organized on a completely voluntary basis. This plan has now been in operation for more than ten years, and in a recent evaluative study, it has been found to be effective. A number of states such as Illinois, California and Michigan have borrowed the basic features of the New York act.

---

*Only thirty-four states reported grants-in-aid programs.

A second pattern of state aid is that represented by the Pennsylvania plan. In the Pennsylvania law, the state library agency is empowered to designate the District Library Centers that are to be established which in turn contract with the public libraries of the district area for supplementary service. Rhode Island, Massachusetts and New Jersey follow this scheme in general.

A third pattern that might be identified is that of Maryland which provides state aid directly to county public libraries in order to achieve a prescribed minimum per capita expenditure. Pennsylvania and Illinois have this feature built into their state aid programs.

One of the crucial difficulties in attempting to broaden and improve public library service is the fact that none of the governmental bodies to which the public library is attached is necessarily the most logical operating unit of service, as Professor Carleton B. Joeckel had discovered earlier. The political boundaries of a village, city or county are often artificial and have become meaningless insofar as public library service is concerned. The official statistics show clearly that there is the widest variation in the quantity and quality of library service that is being furnished. The kind of public library to which a citizen has access depends not on his reading needs but purely on the wealth of the community in which he happens by chance to live. The public library of the past has been chained to a governmental unit that is not large enough to support a modern library adequately. It is just as essential that books and ideas move as freely in a democratic society as do vehicles of transportation. Municipal boundaries must not be allowed to impede the flow of books. It is for this reason that the state must intervene and through the instrument of state aid remove the inequities and barriers that have been permitted to develop. With state aid serving as a catalytic agent, high quality public library service can be made available for all citizens.

Statutory Citations to Major State Aid Legislation

California
West's Annotated California Codes, Education Code, Sect. 27111-27147.

Georgia
Code of Georgia Annotated, Sect. 32-625.

Illinois
Smith-Hurd Illinois Annotated Statutes, Chap. 81, Sect. 111-123.

Indiana
Burn's Annotated Indiana Statutes, Sect. 41-1201 to 41-1214.

Kansas
Kansas Statutes Annotated, Sect. 75-2547 to 75-2552.

Maryland
The Annotated Code of Maryland, Art. 77, Sect. 182A-182B.

Massachusetts
Annotated Laws of Massachusetts, Chap. 78, Sect. 19A-19D.

Michigan
Michigan Statutes Annotated, Sect. 15.1791 (101-127)

New Jersey
New Jersey Statutes Annotated, Sect. 18A: 74-1 to 18A: 74-13.

New York
Consolidated Laws of New York Annotated, Education Law, Sect. 271-273.

Ohio
Page's Ohio Revised Statutes, Sect. 3375.70-3375.73; 3375.80-3375.82.

Oklahoma
Oklahoma Statutes Annotated, Title 65, Sect. 4-101 to 4-110.

Pennsylvania
Purdon's Pennsylvania Statutes Annotated, Title 24, Sect. 4301-4304.

Rhode Island
General Laws of Rhode Island, Sect. 29-6-1 to 29-6-11.

Tennessee
Tennessee Code Annotated, Sect. 10-106.

REFERENCES

American Library Directory, 1968-1969. 26th ed. New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1968.

Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information, 1969. 14th ed. New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1968.

Carl, Herbert A. (ed.). Statewide Long-Range Planning for Libraries; Report of a Conference, September 19-23, 1965. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1966.

Congressional Quarterly Service. Congressional Quarterly Almanac: 1963; 1964; 1967; 1968.

_____. Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report. XXVI (November 22, 1968).

Council of State Governments. The Book of the States, 1968-1969. Chicago: The Council, 1968.

Cowart, Andrew L. "Anti-Poverty Expenditures in the American States: A Comparative Analysis," Midwest Journal of Political Science, XL (May, 1969), 219-236.

Dauer, Manning J., and Kelsay, Robert G. "Unrepresentative States," National Municipal Review, XLIV (December, 1955), 551-75.

Dawson, Richard E. and Robinson, James A. "Inter-Party Competition, Economic Variables and Welfare Policies in the American States," The Journal of Politics, XXV (May, 1963), 265-289.

Drennan, Henry T. "Total and Per Capita Operating Expenditures in Public Libraries, By Size of Population in Service Area, By Region and State: Aggregate United States: Fiscal Year 1962." Unpublished data furnished by author.

Dye, Thomas R. "The Development of Comparative Analysis in State Politics." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Gatlinburg, Tennessee, November 7-9, 1968. Mimeographed.

_____. "Governmental Structure, Urban Environment, and Educational Policy," Midwest Journal of Political Science, XL (August, 1967), 353-380.

_____. "Malapportionment and Public Policy in the States," The Journal of Politics, XXVII (August, 1965), 586-601.

_____. Politics, Economics, and the Public: Policy Outcomes in the American States. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1969.

Fisher, Glen W. "Review of Spending in the American States," The Journal of Politics, XXXI (August, 1969), 848-851.

Garceau, Oliver. The Public Library and the Political Process. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.

Hofferbert, Richard I. "The Relation between the American States," The American Political Science Review, LX (March, 1966), 73-82.

Jacob, Herbert and Vines, Kenneth N. (eds.). Politics in the American States. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1965.

Ladenson, Alex (ed.). American Library Laws. 3rd ed. Chicago: American Library Association, 1964; First Supplement, 1963-1964. 1965; Second Supplement, 1965-1966. 1967; Third Supplement, 1967-1968. Unpublished proof, 1968.

Monypenny, Phillip. The Library Functions of the States, Commentary on the Survey of Library Functions of the States. With the editorial assistance of Guy Garrison. Chicago: American Library Association, 1966.

National Center for Educational Statistics. Statistics of Public Libraries Serving Communities with at Least 25,000 Inhabitants, 1965. U.S.O.E., 1968.

Schubert, Glendon and Press, Charles. "Measuring Malapportionment," American Political Science Review, LVIII (December, 1964), 966-970.

Sharkansky, Ira. Spending in the American States. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1968.

_____. "Agency Requests, Gubernatorial Support and Budget Success in State Legislatures," The American Political Science Review, LXII (December, 1968), 1220-31.

_____. "Economic and Political Correlates of State Government Expenditures: General Tendencies and Deviant Cases," Midwest Journal of Political Science, XL (May, 1967), 173-192.

_____. "Economic Development, Regionalism and State Political Systems," Midwest Journal of Political Science, XII (February, 1968), 41-61.

Survey and Standards Committee, American Association of State Libraries. Standards for Library Functions at the State Level. Chicago: American Library Association, 1963.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. Census of Governments, 1967. Vol. 6. State Payments to Local Governments. 1968.

_____. County and City Data Book, 1967: A Statistical Abstract Supplement. 1967.

_____. Governmental Finances in 1966-1967. Series GF-67, No. 3. 1968.

_____. "Population Estimates, 1968." Series P-20, No. 177; Series P-25, Nos. 304, 380, and 384. 1968.

_____. State Government Finances in 1967. Series GF-67, No. 1. 1968.

_____. Statistical Abstract of the United States: Annual Editions, 1956 through 1969.

_____. U. S. Census of Population, 1960: United States Summary. Vol. I. Characteristics of the Population. 1961.

U. S. Department of Commerce. Survey of Current Business, XLVIII (April, 1968), 26-27.

U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. Area Trends in Employment and Unemployment. 1968.

_____. Statistical Tables on Manpower: A Reprint from the 1968 Manpower Report. 1969.

U. S. Office of Education. Digest of Educational Statistics, 1968; 1969.

_____. National Inventory of Library Needs, 1965. Chicago: American Library Association, 1965.